

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:
AN INQUIRY INTO ITS RELATION TO PRIMITIVE TRADITION.

A THESIS

Submitted to the Board of Theological Studies of the
University of Edinburgh, in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

by

D. Kerr Burns



1933.

FOREWORD.

The primary object of this thesis is to ascertain the source of the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ as stated in the Epistle ^{to the} "Hebrews". Our investigation has led into a number of fields of study concerning which only the specialist can speak. However, the writer has endeavoured to weigh the opinions expressed by such scholars; and trusts that he has, in consequence, arrived at conclusions consistent with the facts.

Since this main teaching of the author of "Hebrews" cannot be segregated from his other ideas, it has been necessary to devote considerable attention to the allied teaching. But, this, more for the purpose of seeing the central doctrine in its true perspective, than of making a complete inquiry into all the theological ideas of the Epistle.

Though the conclusions of this thesis are in wide disagreement with the general verdict of present day scholarship on the Epistle; still the writer gratefully acknowledges his dependence upon their work. Indeed, wherein he has presumed to differ, he has done so, only in following up the suggestions and inferences that scholars have made in their treatment of the Epistle. And in spite of the strongly intrenched opinion to the contrary, it is hoped that the general position, taken herein, merits some consideration.

For the sake of clarity and the convenience of the reader, in nearly all cases where German and French authors have been quoted, an English translation has been provided.

D.K.B.

CONTENTS

Chapter I.

pp.

THE PRESENT POSITION OF SCHOLARSHIP

A Comparison with the Fourth Gospel-dating, Authorship and readers, historicity	1
The Character and purpose of the writing	6
The literary structure	9
Theological relationships	10
Linguistic relations - Philo, Mystery religions	12
The author's knowledge of the Historic Jesus	14

Chapter II.

THE POSSIBILITY OF A NEW APPROACH AND DIFFERENT RESULTS

Method to be employed	16
Neglected aspects of Jewish Messianism, the sacrificial significance of Jesus' death	17
Legitimacy of terming the Epistle a Gnosis	20
The author's use of primitive and advanced teaching	22
(1) The Epistle's idealism	24
(2) His doctrine of the Person of Christ	26
(3) His version of the Law	29
The Priesthood after the order of Melchizedek	33

Chapter III.

AN EXEGESIS OF KEY PASSAGES

3:1	36
4:14-16	41
5: 4-10	42
5:10-14	45
6: 1-3	47
6:20	48
7:	49
7:26-28	50
8: 1-	50
The omologias (3:1, 4:14, 10:23) the basis of his appeal	51

Chapter IV

SOURCES OF THE EPISTLE'S MAIN IDEAS

Philo or Native Judaism	52
Summary	60
The Source of "the Priesthood after the order of Melchizedek"	61
(1) The Pistis Sophia.	62

Chapter IV(Continued).

pp.

(2) Epiphanius' Haereses	64
(3) The Apocrypha of Athanasius	65
(4) The Slavonic Enoch	66
The Church Fathers and the Priesthood of Christ	
(1) The Book of Testimonies	68
(2) The Ante-Nicene Fathers and the Doctrine	71
(3) Nicene and Post-Nicene use of the Epistle	75

Chapter V

SOME PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN TRADITION AND THE EPISTLE

Knowledge of the Historical Jesus	77
Parallels with general Synoptic teaching	81
Underlying Synoptic material and the Epistle	82
The symbolism of the rending of the veil in Luke	82
The symbolism of the high priest's garment	83
The Transfiguration narratives and the Epistle	85
The Sabbath Rest	91
The New Covenant	95

Chapter VI

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE MESSIAH.

The Source of the Messianic idea	101
The Jerusalem dynasty and Psalm 110	103
Genesis XLV	106
Priest-Kingship and the Davidic Dynasty	107
The problem of the scantiness of reference to priest-kingship in the Old Testament scriptures	109
The Asmonaeon use of the title priest-king	109
The Testament of the XII Patriarchs and the redacted sections dealing with the Messiah	110
The Zadokite Fragment	117
The priest-kingly Messianic idea at the beginning of the Christian era	119

Chapter VII

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE MESSIAH (Contd.)

Isaiah 53	121
First Zechariah	126
The Epistle and the main stream of Jewish Messianism	131

Chapter Vlll

pp.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE

Messianic interpretation of Isaiah 53, Ps.110, 1 Zech.	133
New Testament use of Isaiah 53 in which the death of Christ is given a priestly and sacrificial significance.	134
New Testament use of Psalm 110	139
The Influence of the Messianic Prophecies of Zechariah	144
Jesus' use of Zechariah	145
Summary	146

Chapter lX

THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS IN THE LIGHT OF HIS JERUSALEM MINISTRY.

The problem of the four accounts	147
John the Baptist	148
(1) Mandaeanism	149
(2) The relation of the Baptist's mission to that of Jesus	150
(3) The character of John's mission	153
(4) The Messianic claims made for John Baptist	155
The Jerusalem Ministry	157
(1) Jesus' purpose in going to Jerusalem	158
(2) The Messianic entry	159
(3) The duration of the Ministry	163
(4) Jesus and the Cultus	164
(5) The Cleansing of the Temple	168
(6) Jesus use of Psalm 110	172
(7) The Saying re.the Temple destruction	175
(8) The anointing at Bethany	180
(9) The Messianic Secret	183
(10) The Trial	184
Jesus and the Sadducaic Messianic hope	188
The Sadducees and the Early Church	192
Subsidiary evidence of Jesus' claim to Priesthood	197
(1) The death of James	197
(2) Oxyrynchus Papyri 840	200
(3) A Fragment of the Halosis	202
Some other factors in the Trial	204
The Last Supper and the Messianic role of Jesus	206
Summary	212

CONCLUDING REMARKS	216
--------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	218
--------------	-----

CHAPTER I

THE PRESENT POSITION OF SCHOLARSHIP

With the exception of the Fourth Gospel no New Testament writing has excited so much restless investigation as this epistle "To the Hebrews". The latter has presented scarcely less difficulty to scholarship in relating it to other epistolary literature of the New Testament, as the former has in being related to the Synoptics. It is indeed questionable whether modern scholarship has advanced the study of the epistle to nearly the same extent as has undoubtedly been done in the case of the Fourth Gospel. The comparison may appear out of place, but it has much to recommend it. In the first place the two writers have been generally assumed to breathe an unmistakable Alexandrian atmosphere. Again it has been generally contended that both are concerned, mainly, in portraying that aspect of Christianity which was peculiarly associated with each author's own religious experience. Moreover, both have emphasized the universal and eternal character of Christianity. In view of at least these common features, a brief comparison of the results of modern scholarship upon these respective writings is not without point. The consequence of which will indicate that the advance has largely been on the side of the Ephesian Gospel.¹

1. It is only in the most general way that these comparisons are made, the conclusions drawn here are, we believe, justified by the tendencies of much recent Johannine study. For an examination in detail of the results of Johannine Study the reader is referred to such books as: Howard - "The 4th Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation", J.A. Robinson - "The Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel".

In the first place with respect to the dating, there is more unanimity of opinion in recent literature upon the Gospel than upon the *Epistle*. Despite the most thorough examination of every detail of the epistle by modern scholars such as Moffatt, E.F.Scott, McFadyen and Windisch, who argue for a late date, an equally thorough investigation has led to an opposite conclusion by Nairne and Wickham.

English scholarship as a whole may be said to favour an early date of about 67 A.D.¹ The German scholar, Dr. Hans Windisch, who may be taken as representing fairly accurately the opinion of those scholars who favour a much later dating, affirms that in all future efforts at dating, the year 70 must be left out of account.² If it can be definitely demonstrated that the readers do not reside in Jerusalem, then the observation has some real merit. However, the denial of the Jerusalem destination is far from substantiated. The larger proportion of scholarly opinion still favours a Jewish community either in Jerusalem or in Palestine, thus the events of 70 cannot be left out of account. To be sure the author's silence on the fate of Jerusalem does not demand an early apostolic time of writing, (40-60); his silence is only unintelligible, if writing immediately after 70 and to Jerusalem; for either it belongs to the early apostolic period or a period so remotely removed from 70 that the memory of 70 has died out. This is very unlikely since Timothy is still a vigorous/

1. See McNeile's "Introduction to N.T.Literature".

2. Handbuch Zum Neun Testament, 14. "Der Hebraerbrief" p.129.

vigorous evangelist, (13:23); and even the eighties, which many fix upon, is not far enough removed to explain the absence of direct reference to the destruction of the Temple. The fact, insisted upon by those favouring a late date, and Gentile readers, that it is the tabernacle which our author has in mind, counts for little in determining either date or destination, since this does not preclude the justifiable view that the cult of the Herodian temple was also running in the author's thoughts (10:11). An early apostolic date has much to commend it, still the internal evidence of the epistle does not afford complete proof. From what one gathers from an examination of the literature on the matter, all dating of the epistle is conjectural within the limits of its not being earlier by many years than the Jewish war with Rome, nor later than it would have furnished occasion for quotation by Clement in 95 A.D.

The problem of authorship of the Fourth Gospel remains an enigma, but it has not lent itself so readily to the guesswork - probably inevitable - which has been the feature of the ingenious attempts to name the writer of the epistle. Origen's well known remark on the matter is really still the opinion of most scholars.¹ Apart from the complete abandonment of Pauline authorship - which in part was done by the church Fathers - no advance has been made in identifying the author; Luther's/

1. H.E. VI. 28:14.

Luther's Appollos theory is as plausible as is Harnack's Priscilla, revived by M.A.R.¹Tucker; as is also Tertullian's recently contended for by Monsignor Barnes.² The linguistic resemblances with Luke, referred to by Eusebius,³ receive additional support from the elaborate language parallels shown by two scholars of more recent times⁴ to exist between the Gospel of Luke and the Epistle. Equally remarkable are the parallels with Mark, and also with 1 Peter.⁵ One is left with the impression that there are other more important aspects of the Epistle requiring study which if prosecuted with the same energy would have led to less futile results.

It is with the same solicitous regard that both the author of ^{the} Johannine writings and our Epistle address their readers. It is certain that the Gospel was written for the whole Church and it is almost as certain that readers of the Epistle were a small group personally known to the author. He might very well have expressed his affectionate yearning for his friends in the language of 1 John 2:1. Generally speaking opinion has oscillated between a community in Italy of Gentile Christians, and one of Jewish Christians, not necessarily in Jerusalem. Most/

1. Article "The Gospel according to Prisca" Nineteenth Century, Jan.1913.
2. See Article: "St.Barnabas and the Epistle to Hebrews" Hilbert Journal Vol.xxx, 1931-32, p.103.
3. H.E.VI. 25:14.
4. Alexander: "Leading Ideas of the Gospels", pp.302-324.
5. A. Welch "Authorship of Epistle to Hebrews" 1898. He follows the arguments of F.Rendall "The Theology of the Hebrew Christians" in maintaining Petrine authorship on the ground of the resemblance in language and ideas with 1 Peter.

Most recent opinion favours the latter (Wickham, Nairne and Windisch). Probably no better argument for the epistle being addressed to Jewish readers has been advanced than that of A.S. Peake (Century Bible pp.13-16). Prof. E.F. Scott's study of the epistle, in which the Roman destination and Gentile character of the readers has been insisted upon, seems to have marked the turning point of opinion to the opposite conclusion. This has had its consequent influence upon the interpretation of the Epistle. It has been accepted not so much because it is conclusive, but ~~because~~ it appears to explain more, and fails to explain less than the contrary view.

A comparison of the results of critical investigation upon the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews, is nowhere more noticeable than when we come to consider the character and contents of the Epistle, to evaluate its theology, and indicate its relation to other New Testament writings. To a certain extent, it may be said that the Fourth Gospel has regained some of the lost respect for its historical character within recent years (It has been shown to have points of contact with a tradition even more reliable on certain points than the Synoptics). It is no longer an alien among the accounts of the life of Jesus; some even going so far as to find in it a genuine aspect of the mind of the historic Jesus. But the Epistle to the Hebrews has not received any such historical justification for its theological contentions, and it has been argued that the author never had the remotest intention of doing so. It remains an alien "without father without mother", despite the great influence, /

influence, which from the first, it had upon the developing thought of the Christian Church.

It does appear nothing short of mere folly to suggest, in the face of the whole history of careful study of the Epistle, that different results might be obtainable - the contention of this thesis; but for the present it will be our concern to outline the main position, which scholarship has taken up, on its character, purpose, its literary, religious and theological values, relationships and origins.

There is a growing disposition on the part of many to view the epistle less as a theological treatise and more as a practical word of exhortation addressed at a time of crisis to a small group in the Church. Though Prof. Scott calls attention to this feature of the writing, and Prof. Nairne¹ vigorously calls in question Dr. Moffatt's characterization of it as an isolated and uninfluential specimen of Alexandrian speculation, neither has, in his treatment of the Epistle, varied appreciably from the opinion presented by Dr. Moffatt in his treatment of the Epistle in the Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament and the Commentary on the Epistle. It may be safely said that, though each of the aforementioned writers has made an independent and valuable contribution to the literature on the subject, generally speaking we must still regard the writing, so far as modern scholarship is concerned, very much in/

1. "The Epistle of Priesthood" p.8,9. While Prof. Nairne, in opposition to much recent opinion, insists upon the practical character of the writing and its unity with other N.T. thought, he retains, despite that, the opinion of its being a speculative treatise as regards its main doctrine.

in the light of Prof. Moffatt's conclusions. Prof. Scott writes:

"We approach it from the wrong point of view if we regard it as a normal example of Christian teaching in the last part of the first century. When due weight is allowed to a number of indications, we have rather to consider it as a Gnosis communicated by a revered teacher to a select circle of his disciples".

Prof. Scott continues,

"He declares in so many words that 'The world to come is the subject of our discussion (Heb. 2:5)'. This new doctrine based on an exegesis which to us may appear frigid and artificial, has come to him by divine illumination and bears the authentic marks of Gnosis". 1.

In much the same manner Windisch characterizes the writing:

"It is an example of theological Gnosis which expresses a secret language borrowed from the Old Testament, and which seeks to deepen the understandings of the fundamentals of the Christian teaching through presenting parallels with great figures and views of the Old Testament." 2.

The application of the term Gnosis - which term is carefully qualified by both writers - is but the more definite classification of the method employed by the author, which older scholars like Bishop Westcott and Prof. A. B. Bruce, referred to as theological speculation. The legitimacy of this popular characterization will be considered at a later stage.

The purpose of the author is ^{so} bound up with the other inextricable problems of date, readers, and historical circumstances, theories about which are merely plausible, that in consequence there is little common opinion among even the most recent writers. It is impossible to give them concise classification. However, upon the ~~question of~~ the danger which obviously threatened the readers, the bulk of the literature on the subject appears to have agreed to disagree upon the two alternatives: (1)/

1. "Epistle to the Hebrews" pp. 37, 38.
2. Ibid. supra. p. 46.

Chapter 1

alternatives: (1) the author writes to stay a reversion to Judaism;¹ (2) they are threatened by religious lassitude and possible loss of Christian faith through an intellectual failure to grasp its completeness and finality.² As to the main subject upon which the author has chosen to write to these "imperfect churchmen"³ or "apostatizing Jewish Christians", it has been generally held to be the "High-Priesthood of Christ" or "The Unseen Spiritual Realities" (Scott, McFadyen).⁴ With regard to the underlying causes for the readers' need for a word of exhortation, numerous suggestions have been made. Prof.A.B. Bruce has summed these up under three heads: (1) "The superseding of an ancient divinely appointed religion by what appeared to be an innovation and a novelty; (2) The humiliation and suffering of Jesus regarded as the Christ; (3) The absence therefrom of a priesthood and a sacrificial ritual".⁵ With slight variation these conclusions are followed by those who conceive the readers danger of lapse to be that of a reversion to Judaism.⁶ The apparent weakness, of assigning such motives to the author, has been pointed out by Prof.Scott to be due to the common assumption that it contains a whole system of theology complete in itself. As to whether the sole and immediate object of the Epistle is to give/

1. Ibid.supra pp.22,23. Nairne.
2. Scott, ibid.supra p.42: McNeile: "N.T.in Light of St.Paul", ch.lX, thinks the danger is that of falling into Paganism.
3. Nairne, ibid.supra p.30.
4. "Through Eternal Spirit", p.23.
5. A.B.Bruce "Epistle to Hebrews", ch.1, p.21.
6. See an article by Henrik Frick in "Mysterium Christi" pp.247-277.

give instruction on a single and new doctrine *is* ,
 still an open question. That he is not elaborating a whole new
 theology is evident, but it is far from reasonable that the
 exposition of a fanciful new speculation could have been cal-
 :culated by the writer to serve the purpose of rallying luke-
 warm or apostatizing Christians.

The structure of the Epistle has called forth a great
 deal of detailed study. Probably a sentence from the most
 recent commentary illustrates best the opinion of moder scholar-
 :ship:

"It seems to be a collection of testimonies of faith,
 exegesis treatises and admonitions which are held together by
 one great fundamental thought - Jesus, the Son of God, is our
 true High Priest and bringer and guarantor of our redemption...
 This characteristic must be emphasized, that one cannot divide
 Hebrew into two chief parts, the theological and practical, but
 the paranetic always breaks through the evidence of faith and
 Scripture." 1

This peculiarity of style accounts for the difficulty commonly
 experienced in following the author's argument. However, the
 recognition of this framework of Old Testament oracles, upon
 which he has woven his argument, is a real advance towards a
 better appreciation of the position which the Epistle occupies
 in relation to other literature of the New Testament. Suffic-
 :ient allowance has scarcely been made as yet for the bearing
 of this upon, for example, the writer's doctrine of the person
 of Christ. Certainly he is employing the scriptural passages
 used in common by all the writers in the New Testament, and it
 has not been shown that his interpretation of these passages
 diverges to any appreciable extent from others employing the same. 2

Prof./

1. Windisch Ibid. supra p.8

2. Hoskyns' "Riddle of the N.T." (p.p.241f.) confirms this opinion.

Prof. Nairne¹ is probably the only one who has given any recognition in his study of the Epistle to the possibility of there being very little in the New Testament teaching about the person of Christ which can be termed, a passage from low to high doctrine; that the dating or classification of the Epistle's teaching by means of the popularly accepted categories of New Testament Christology may prove to be arbitrary. This view is overruled by the conspicuous place, which it is averred, Philonic thought has had upon the writer. Primitive Messianic beliefs of the early church are to be found side by side with that which bears the unmistakable stamp of Alexandrianism. In consequence the Christological position of the author is held to reflect a decidedly advanced character. "His Christology marks a transition between the early adoptionist Christology and the later essential divinity of the Son as identical with God".²

Though there is a growing opinion that the Epistle is no longer to be regarded as an isolated segment of New Testament teaching, and though regarded, in the main, as reflecting the normal teaching of the last decades of the first century, still the method in which the author expresses them is a feature which cuts him off from the Pauline theological modes and at the same time makes it impossible to identify them with any definitely known tradition. Scott suggests³ that it is the product of a separate form of Gentile Christianity. It has been repeatedly pointed out that the^{author} is in touch with a very primitive traditional theology/

1. Nairne: "Epistle of Priesthood" pp.26-30.
2. Strachan: "Historic Jesus in N.T." ch.VI.p.100, "it marks a stage in creedal revaluation of Jesus which reaches its climax in John". See also MacNeill: "Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews", p.122.
3. Ibid.supra p.65.

Chapter 1

theology in respect of the Parousia, his use of the term Kurios, his thought of salvation, belief in evil spirits and the analogies with the speech of Stephen in Acts. The author's teaching, too, upon the death of Christ, while subject to his ruling idea of the priesthood of Christ, is built upon the doctrine Paul claims to have received (1 Cor.15:3). However, there is still sharp division of opinion as to what view of the atonement, if any, is to be inferred from the Epistle. Though his interpretation of the death of Christ differs from that of Paul's main views,¹ there has been little attempt to test the validity of his conception of the efficacy of that death, based as it is upon the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, by an enquiry into the possible influence which that system had upon Jesus' own conception of His death.

Again with regard to the suggested unity of doctrine with the rest of the New Testament, exception is made, to the view that he has added nothing, in the case of his main doctrine, the priesthood of Christ; it is either invented or borrowed. Still there is not complete agreement on this exception, as is also the case in regard to those ideas of his on the New Covenant, the two worlds, a new Temple and a new sacrifice - that these ideas are new and original are largely taken for granted.

There/

1. Rawlinson: "Foundations" (1912, p.194.): "Apart from three phrases in Paul and Eph.V:2, where it is not a sin offering but a burnt offering, there does not appear to be any passages in St.Paul which interpret the work of Christ in sacrificial terms", (foot note).

There is need to indicate, in this necessarily brief outline, the results of linguistic study of the Epistle, which has occupied a particularly prominent place in its recent literature. Dr. Deissmann in his "Light from the Ancient East"¹ brings out the remarkable change from the colloquial diction of most of the other New Testament writings which the Epistle to The Hebrews represents. Though^{it is} generally contended that Dr. Deissmann's characterization of New Testament language needs considerable qualification, still it emphasizes just the distinction which has always been expressed by commentators. The chief influence is customarily assigned to the Septuagint. However great this influence, it is to be remarked that not all of the^{author's} quotations are from it or even from the Hebrew Bible. This is another point which nearly every study of the Epistle's linguistic affinities have called attention to. There is reason to believe that it may furnish the clue to the source of some of the ideas peculiar to the Epistle.

An exhaustive investigation of the language parallels with Philo of Alexandria has led scholars to the conclusion that here is the source of not only many of the writer's phrases but of the peculiar Hellenistic tone of his theology. Siegfried's "Philo von Alexandria" is still the standard work upon the language relationships with the New Testament literature. In this work the/

1. "The Epistle to Hebrews shows us Christianity preparing for a flight from its native levels into the higher regions of culture, and we are conscious of the beginning of a Christian world literature". p.245.

the lingual and phraseological aspects of the Epistle's relationship with the writings of Philo are dealt with in detail, (pp.321,ff.). On the whole Siegfried's conclusions agree closely with those in modern commentaries on the Epistle. "It is admitted universally that the writer of the Epistle had been educated in the Alexandrine school.....this does not prove that he had read Philo."¹ In spite of this, and in spite of not only linguistic but frequent antithetical theological ideas which Siegfried and others, such as Prof.Scott and H.A.A.Kennedy, have indicated, practically all scholars are of the opinion that Philo is the source of the Epistle's doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ and his peculiar exegesis of the Melchizedek passage of which so much is made. Upon this point Windisch writes:

"Philo sees in Melchizedek a vision of Logos, who is also a priest and who brings peace and righteousness to the soul. In this point also one cannot regard Hebrews absolutely independently from Philo." 2.

This is sufficient to show the strongly entrenched opinion, which still exists, that the main ideas of the Epistle are foreign to the body of early Christian tradition.

Efforts have been made to trace the influence of the language of the Mystery religions upon that of the Epistle. The only possible reference made in the Epistle to the existence of such cults is that in Ch.X:25.³ H.L.MacNeill thinks that there is evident influence of the mysteries upon his view of salvation and singles out Heb.5:7-9 and 7: as bearing unmistakable evidence of/

1. Siegfried, *ibid.*supra. p.321
2. Windisch, *ibid.*supra. p.61
3. See Moffatt:I.C.C. "Hebrews" p. 148.

of this influence. He follows Reitzenstein, who shows that many of the concepts in the Epistle are coloured by Hellenistic¹ Mystery religions.

Finally what has modern scholarship to say of the author's knowledge of the historical Jesus? There is almost unanimous agreement that there are definite allusions to the historical Jesus in the Epistle. The suggestion, that the figure of Jesus portrayed in the Epistle could have any other explanation than that it is based on a reliable tradition of His life, is not even hinted at by the majority of students of the Epistle. Prof. Moffatt has most emphatically denied the possibility of the allusions to the historic Jesus being explained away. He asserts:

"The writer's starting point is not to be sought in some semi-metaphysical idea like that of the eternal Son, as a supernatural being, who dipped into humanity for a brief interval....." 2.

But Prof. Windisch is equally certain of a contrary conclusion. In the first place from a study of the most frequently used designations of the person of the Saviour, he concludes that they have nothing to do with an "historical mortal" Jesus. He writes:

"The Jesus of Hebrews is not a human being who has won veneration as Divine through His consciousness of His mission, His teaching and His suffering, but a divine Being that had descended to earth clothed in flesh and blood.one rather finds sufficient source for his knowledge of the life of Jesus in the traditional Messiah myth and in the LXX." 3.

This surely represents a drastic departure from the main position of opinion on the Epistle. His argument that the whole theology of/

1. MacNeill: "Christology of Epistle to Hebrews", pp.108-112.
2. Commentary p.11
3. Ibid.supra. pp.25,26.

of the Epistle can be thus explained looks plausible enough, particularly in view of a long standing tendency on the part of scholars to see the Epistle almost entirely in terms of a theological speculation. Prof. Windisch has merely carried this to what seemingly is the logical conclusion, in regard to the Jesus of "Hebrews".

As to the validity of such a conclusion, it, like the other results of scholarship stated and illustrated by quotation in this introductory chapter, must be reserved for consideration at a later point in this study. However, it is appropriate to observe here that had we no other sources than those references in the Epistle, the life obtained therefrom would not be the Synoptic picture, but this was neither the purpose of the author's writing any more than it was for Paul when he wrote his Epistles. It would be rash to conclude, therefore, that he neither knew of, nor was working from, a traditional Christian account of the life of Jesus. One cannot read the Epistle in an unbiassed manner without receiving an impression that the writer is inspired by, and has his eyes fixed on, something more than the idea of a mythical historical Being. The writer is too deadly in earnest to be toying with any such fantastic figure as Windisch implies. Any attempt to account for the ideas of the Epistle apart from a knowledge of the historical Christian tradition, is not less ingenious than the Christianity-myth theories long exploded.

THE POSSIBILITY OF A NEW APPROACH AND DIFFERENT RESULTS

Common sense should warn against questioning the above conclusions which represent the results of the most thorough study of the Epistle on the part of modern scholars. But in the first place, we believe there are aspects of early and late Judaistic Messianism, together with elements of first century Christian tradition, which afford a basis for an altogether different interpretation of the Epistle. In the next place, the very fact, that scholarship is agreed that the Epistle serves a practical purpose through the medium of a speculative treatise, provokes dissent to such a paradoxical conclusion. These are the main considerations which justify the present study.

Generally speaking, the method to be employed in the succeeding chapters is to go back to the main religious ideas of Judaism and its original Messianic expectation, and calculate the influence which those sources might have exerted upon the formation of a tradition which could be held responsible for giving the "Epistle to the Hebrews" its present form. The method generally employed, I think it is fair to say, has been to trace back the ideas of the Book and invariably it leads into a number of diverse channels which bear scarcely any relationship to each other. It is granted that the main streams of great religious ideas have, even in the distant past, been formed by the intermingling of many smaller streams of varying quality of purity; but it is by no means arbitrary opinion to say/

say that those smaller streams of foreign influence had already, before the time of our Lord, mingled, some more perfectly than others, with the great currents of the distinctively Judaistic. It is contended therefore, that native Judaism, as has often been suspected in the case of other New Testament writings, could have produced, even in the mind of Jesus, ideas not dissimilar to those which are the burden of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Though it is admitted that this can only be imperfectly substantiated, nevertheless it is certain that the mind of Jesus was more capable of recognizing "the Pearl of great price" in the treasure house of Judaistic religious ideas, than was the later Church and our author of the Epistle.

Thus one of the objects of this study is to show that there are neglected aspects, for instance, of early and later Jewish Messianism which played a more important part in Jewish religion than is commonly given them, and that their influence upon the mind of our Lord was not slight. From childhood we were taught to think of our Lord as Prophet, Priest and King. We have been able to trace back this conception of him as Prophet and King to the dignity ascribed to him in the Synoptics and to the popular Jewish messianic beliefs. It is otherwise with the title "priest" which the Epistle to the Hebrews is credited with having been the first to make the title current. The applicability and the religious value of this designation has always been felt, but we have had no reason/

Chapter 11.

reason to believe that Jesus ever so thought of himself. As a matter of fact, the historical Jesus has been represented as the very antithesis of those qualities associated with priesthood. However, the writer of our Epistle though telling us more about the human historical Jesus than any other of the epistolary writers, finds a place in his portrait of Jesus for the qualities and functions of a High Priest. Of course, he expressly tells us that Jesus could not have been a priest while on earth, that His priesthood is of another order to that which ministered in the Temple at Jerusalem or in the Tabernacle in the wilderness, yet he manifested all the characteristics of a true priest even while on earth. And though the only priestly act, which he attributes to Jesus, is that sacrifice "made once for all outside the camp", it may prove to be true that this attachment of a priestly sacrificial character to the death of our Lord is not only closer to the traditional view of Jesus' death, upon which Paul built his doctrines of the atonement, but is an approximate reproduction of the mind of Jesus on the significance of His death. With a view of giving historical justification to the Epistle's use of the priestly signification of the life and death of Jesus, we shall go back in the process of this study to examine the part, if any, which the priesthood of the Messiah occupied in Jewish thought from the beginning of Israelitish history, tracing it up through pre-exilic and post exilic thought and through the inter-testamental literature. In addition, to re-examine the Gospels for evidence of its possible influence upon the mind of Jesus.

The/

Moreover it is not merely on the grounds of the light which such a study will throw upon the understanding of the Epistle that exception is taken to the results of much of modern inquiry, for the Epistle itself furnishes the strongest evidence of the existence of a tradition in which most of its ideas were current. The general grounds for this assertion are simply some of the results of the investigations of modern scholarship on the Epistle.

Objection was taken in the first chapter to the characterization of it as a Gnosis (page 4); though it would be claimed by those who use the term that this differs from referring to the Epistle as a theological speculation, the result of intellectual exercise, the other, spiritual intuition; nevertheless, both are lacking in plausibility when placed alongside other conclusions by the same scholars. It is the opinion that the ^{author} writes to readers who are in danger of standing still, returning to Judaism or lapsing into paganism. Is it likely, in the face of any of these particular circumstances, that the author would have met the situation by any such means as he is said to have employed? In the first place, if the readers were Gentiles, as Prof. Scott and those of his mode of thinking agree, would a Philonic Gnosis upon an isolated passage in the Jewish scriptures, in which the Levitical sacrificial system and the office of high priest played such a conspicuous part, form ^a strong enough appeal to quicken their enthusiasm? Prof. Scott has partly met this objection in his discussion of the nationality of the readers, contending that the Hebrew scriptures was the Bible of the Gentile Christian/

Christian Church.¹ It is felt that, however this may justify the author's extensive appeal to the O.T., it fails to satisfy the present objection.

The description of the Epistle as Gnosis, is based upon the peculiar use which the author makes of scripture, but it has never been shown to any appreciable extent that his general employment of scripture differs in any respect from the other New Testament writers. It is recognized that the writer is truer to the Rabbinical form of exegesis than even Paul who undoubtedly employs the method in vogue in the Alexandrine school, of penetrating to the hidden meaning of a text. Prof. Nairne confirms this loyalty to the word of scripture when he writes, "the original intention of the words is never forgotten; arbitrary applications are never forced upon them."² The whole contention of both Windisch and Scott, that it is the author's purpose to lead the readers on into the deeper and hidden purport of the Christian revelation, is^{based upon} the use which the author makes of Gen.XIV: 18, direct use of which is not made elsewhere in the New Testament. Even though this may be a true enough designation of the writer's employment of this passage, and in spite of the large place it occupies in the Epistle, it does appear strange that his exegesis of this one verse should differ so radically from his general practice of employing scripture. One is led to conclude that the characterization of the whole Epistle as a Gnosis is based more upon the assumption that the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ and its Melchizedek association, is an entirely new conception to the readers to which/

1. "Epistle to the Hebrews" p.16.

2. "Epistle of Priesthood" p.251.

which they are being introduced for the first time, than that it is immediately inferable from the writer's use of Scripture.

It is upon the same grounds that the Epistle has been so long regarded as a deliberate theological speculation. The too ready assumption that the central theme was new, that the setting aside of the Levitical system in the manner in which the author does, was warranted only by a clever bit of speculation on the part of the author, has probably unnecessarily impoverished our knowledge of the reliable historical tradition of the early first century and caused the neglect of certain features of our Lord's life and teaching which contain intimations and hints of the genuineness of those very points in the Epistle¹ which scholarship has agreed to call speculative. No one suggests more clearly the extreme probability of the existence of such a tradition than Prof. Scott himself, when he writes, "Even the ideas which constitute his Gnosis are not altogether.. novel..... It is evident that our Epistle, in spite of its half-esoteric character, is something more than the manifesto of an individual thinker."² The matter is far from settled in the minds of modern scholars.

Though students of the Epistle have granted its many contacts with primitive tradition, they regard that tradition as having at many points undergone a process of development at the hands of our author. This conclusion rests not so much upon any actual demonstration that deliberate development has been given to primitive ideas, but more upon the assumption that the author/

1. See ch.IX.

2. "Epistle to the Hebrews" p.46.

author can be detected to have given an elaborate speculation upon the priesthood after the order of Melchizedek; and, consequently, it is thought that some of the other ideas^{which} he made use of, were developed in harmony with it. We believe that there is little justification for thinking so, and for good reasons.

For scholars have recognized the existence in the Epistle of fundamentally primitive ideas, together with ideas regarded as decidedly advanced. The common error has been in viewing, what has the appearance of advanced doctrine, to be due to the creative work of the author. Whereas the fact that both primitive and advanced categories of thought occur side by side in the Epistle, points, not to the creation or employment of non-Christian categories, but^{to} the repetition of a tradition, which contained the primitive as well as the so-called advanced doctrine. To a certain extent this has been recognized, but little has been done to apply it as a working principle for the understanding of the Epistle as a whole. The chief obstacle again being the author's doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. He was, on this point scholars have been convinced, creating something new or at least giving it an unheard of development. But, besides this doctrine, it has been felt^{that} there are at least three other teachings which bear the stamp of originality and newness to Christian thought of the first century, namely: his idealism, his view of the person of Christ and his version of the Law.

We shall now examine these respectively. Should the author prove to be merely repeating a traditional form of these, then/

Chapter 11

then the common opinion that he is creating theology must be seriously modified. And furthermore the probabilities, ^{in favour of} his main theme the priesthood of Christ - upon which all three appear dependent - proving to be a repeated tradition, are all the greater.

1. Does the author's idealism represent an advanced stage of reflection upon the primitive Gospel? Prof. Scott writes: "The book is specially noteworthy as we can trace in it the actual transition from the apocalyptic to the philosophical mode of thought."¹ Surely this is taking it for granted that the philosophical was foreign to any primitive Christian tradition. At any rate, the idealism in our Epistle does represent something entirely different from the forms in which apocalypticism expressed its ideas of the other world and other age. The early apocalyptic hopes of the Christian Church are found side by side with other views which are evidently of a Platonic cast; and, as is frequently observed, no attempt at reconciliation or even awareness of their incongruity seems to have crossed the mind of the author. It does strike one as strange - assuming that the writer is definitely creating a new view or making a transition from apocalypticism - that he should have retained the old views in an unaltered form. Two conclusions can be drawn from this. The first is, that, according to the inference of present day discussion of the point, the author has not clearly worked out in his own mind the implications of this new philosophical view, and he is not independent enough a thinker to break entirely with so strong an element in the/

1. "The Kingdom of God". p.152.

Chapter 11

the primitive tradition. That is plausible, but there is an alternative conclusion which we think is even more credible; the author is simply dependent upon a tradition or traditions in which both diverse elements occurred, and he has faithfully preserved both.

The Synoptic records attribute to Jesus definite apocalyptic ideas, similar yet dissimilar in many respects from the Jewish Apocryphal writings; the same records also attribute to Jesus a type of teaching which approximates closely to that form of idealism found, for instance, in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Prof. Scott himself admits this, when speaking of Jesus' view of the Kingdom he writes: "The Kingdom stands for the higher spiritual order.....we can trust God in His providence; we can live for the everlasting things; we can reach out through all appearances to that which lies beyond, and which alone is real."¹ But a little later on in his book, he infers that the idealism of our author is his own and drawn from non-Christian sources. Is it possible that the Christian writer of "Hebrews" arrived at his idealism entirely apart from that of his Master about whom he is writing? Of course, it is contended that Platonic idealism was foreign to the mind of our Lord. Nevertheless, it has yet to be demonstrated just wherein the idealism of our Epistle approaches closer to Platonic forms than to a type of idealism long associated with Judaistic thought and inherent in the teaching of Jesus.² Furthermore that there existed a pre-Pauline Hellenistic tradition within the Church is an opinion which/

1. "The Kingdom of God", pp.111,112.

2. Buchanan Gray "Sacrifice in the O.T".(pp.175ff.), suggests the author's dependence on Jesus' teaching. See ch.IV of this treatise.

Chapter 11

which has met with considerable acceptance, though it is difficult to demonstrate. It is apparent that there could have and did exist a form of idealism, in the mind of Jesus, and among a Hellenistic group in the Jerusalem Church, which could have provided the source of the author's idealism. At any rate the presence in the Epistle of two separate concepts of the order of things points to the fact that he is borrowing from Christian tradition two entirely different concepts rather than creating one out of the other. He is reproducing traditional views just at those points where he is accused of recasting the older tradition. As we will attempt to show in the following chapter by an examination of the text, he is following known doctrines, with suitable explanations of their universal and eternal validity. This does seem more reasonable than to regard the author as leading his readers out into a new Christian system of thought, dominated by one principle doctrine of which they had never heard tell until then. This in view of the practical character of the epistle, its intense urgency, its note of crisis and repeated exhortations to hold fast, all of which are more and more being stressed by students of the Epistle.

2. This is again evidenced in the case of the author's doctrine of the person of Christ. We grant that there are elements of a higher doctrine than that supposed to characterize primitive Christology. But the question again is, was the advance/

Chapter 11

advance due to the author or to the primitive sources from which he derived his material? We believe that what has been shown to be true of the Synoptics, in respect of their treatment of their source material, is equally applicable to the Epistle to the Hebrews.¹ Just as they found a doctrine of Christ's person already imposed upon the material they used, which shows through their various attempts at a higher synthesis, so the writer of "Hebrews" has preserved a number of designations of Christ's person none of which can be said to be a heightened Christology.² H.L. MacNeill has shown that in many respects the author's doctrine of Christ's person approximates to that found in the early chapters of Acts (1+12), but in other respects regards him as having made a distinct advance upon this, representing on the whole a position between that of Paul and John.³ What our author has really done is to preserve both what may be termed a low teaching and high teaching about the person of Jesus.⁴ He does not attempt a synthesis any more than Matthew when he incorporated Mt. 11: 25-27 into his Gospel.

Moreover, the view that he has created a new doctrine out of older material is a questionable one, in view of the manner in which he expresses his view of the person of Christ through scriptural texts. For he simply states his doctrine of Christ's person in the language of the Old Testament scriptural/

1. Hoskyn's: "The Riddle of the New Testament" pp. 158-160.
2. ὁ Χριστός, ὁ ἀπὸστολος, ὁ κύριος, ὁ υἱός, ὁ πρὸς ὁκός
3. The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, see ch. 111, cf. Burkitt: "The Church and Gnosis" ch. IV., asserting that the Christology in John 1, is adoptionist.
4. cf. Hebrews 1:5, 1:9, with 5:8, 6:6.

Chapter 11

scriptural texts which were the common property of the early Church.¹ He can speak of Jesus at the same time as Lord and as Son of God. Jesus being *KÚPIOS* makes it possible for him to quote Ps1.102:25 (Heb.1:10); and at once Jesus becomes pre-existent and present at creation; his thought has nothing to do with metaphysics, he is only employing an inherited usage which may go back to Jesus himself, (Mk.13:31).

The two psalms upon which the author bases his doctrine² of Christ are Ps1.8 and Ps1.110. It is these two psalms that Paul has linked together in 1 Cor.15:25-27 and Eph.1:20-22. There is no need to suggest that our author is borrowing his use of them from Paul. Both merely reflect the common use of them in the early church. In every respect the author is repeating a common traditional use of Ps1.8 and 110. Exception, however, is taken to the elaborate use which he makes of Ps1.110:4 in chapters V-vi:11.³ That the author is only repeating the traditional doctrine of the church with regard to the Sonship of Christ is granted, yet exception is made to his doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, upon which the whole interpretation of his Christological position is held to depend. However a comparison of 1:5,6 with 5:5,6, indicates that the author puts the Sonship of Christ on a par with that of His priesthood, in suggesting as he does that there was a particular time of His inception both into Sonship and Priesthood./

1. Selwyn: "Oracles of New Testament", (pp.133f.) *emphasizes this.*

2. See B.W.Bacon, Expos.Times. Xl11, p.345.

3. Rawlinson suggests that this verse of Ps1.110:4 may not only have been in the mind of Jesus on the occasion of the Last Supper, but may be one of the influences upon His thought of His Mess. role. - A.E.J.Rawlinson: "Essays on Trinity and Incarnation", p.p. 38,39.

Priesthood. There is nothing to show just when he regarded that as having taken place, but that he has in mind some definite occasion during the lifetime of Jesus, is the opinion of many scholars.¹ Again there is an entire absence in the text (5:5,6) of anything which suggests that he was doing anything more than he was in 1:5,6, repeating an accepted doctrine of the priesthood of Christ.

3. One is again led to enquire whether the author is not also repeating a known traditional view of the Law. Scholars have remarked upon the scanty influence which Paul has had upon the author. This is one of the many other indications of the far from universal influence which Paul had upon the early Church.² They appear to have so little in common in their attitude to the Law that scholars on the one hand have declared that there can be no Pauline influence. This because to Paul "the Law is juridical and to our author it is ceremonial".³ On the other hand the opinion has been expressed that our author supplements Paul.⁴ The fact is that the Law in "Hebrews" cannot be adequately characterized as dealing only with the ceremonial. It appears to be such because of the exigencies of his theme. When he speaks in (2:2) of the Law which is given by the mediation of angels, he is not thinking merely of the regulations which provided for the cultus.⁵ No more is he when he speaks of the Law as a shadowy representation of the consummated redemption which Christ brought (7:9, 10:1). Christ/

1. H.L. MacNeill, (ibid. supra. pp. 85, 86.) discusses the point.
2. See Campbell Moody: "The Faith of the Early Christian Converts". Chapters 1 and 2 particularly.
3. Moffatt's commentary on "Hebrews", p. 135.
4. Windisch, ibid. supra p. 65
5. Dodd's: Expositor's Greek Commentary, "Hebrews" (p. 226) does not put such a narrow interpretation on it.

Christ became the fulfiller of the Law. That which was sought after again and again according to the Law - but never reached - Christ brought about once and for all.

Consequently the author of the Epistle is either consciously supplementing Paul, creating something entirely original, or it may be that he is touching upon and reproducing a more legitimately Christian conception of the Law than Paul. Prof. Nairne writes of the Epistle's distinctive view of the Law:¹

"It goes far beyond anything St. Paul had said about the Law, and yet how much more easy to reconcile with the Gospels than with Paul. Of the Law our Lord had said 'not one jot or tittle should pass....' "

Efforts have fairly successfully been made to indentify Paul's view of the Law with that of Jesus;² but there has also to be taken into consideration the close approximation of "Law" in our Epistle to "the Law" in the Epistle of James, which similarity is not accidental, and argues for a common traditional source which may put both more in harmony with Jesus than is Paul.

If the Epistle of James reflects, as some suppose, conditions in the Jerusalemite Church, its attitude to the Law is significant when compared with that of "Hebrews". In James (1:25 ff.), "the perfect law of liberty", is obviously not the Pauline version of the Law. For Paul's obedience to any objective law is not required. But for James, it is the observance of God's law that ensures a man's salvation, "to visit the fatherless and the widows....". In like manner in Hebrews, the Christian life is represented as one of obedience or of endurance/

1. Ibid. supra. p.153

2. H.A.A. Kennedy, The Expositor XII makes out a strong case for reconciling Paul with Jesus on the Law.

endurance in the service of God to the end. McGiffert points out that the conception of Christianity as a law is found in nearly all the patristic writings.¹ Patristic fathers, may be building their conception of Christianity as a law upon Hebrews or James and the Jerusalem church, but it is more plausible that all are dependent upon a common tradition which² was more primitive and influential than that of Paul.

Moreover the two Epistles in question share the idea of being brought into something new by Christ, in the sense that the old was now obsolete, (Cf. James 1:25-27, Heb.8:10-13). In James there is scarcely the idea of Christ having fulfilled the Law as in Hebrews. In Hebrews it is the replacing of the Law under the old covenant by that under the New Covenant; in James it is the reorientating of the Christian's life to the demands of "a new law of liberty".

The main attitude to the Law in "Hebrews" is also paralleled to a certain degree by the Synoptics. This apart from the saying attributed to Jesus regarding^{ad in 8} the fulfillment of the Law. The Synoptics represent Jesus as attacking in particular the Rabbinic practices and exegesis of the Law; in Hebrews Christ comes to set aside the Levitic priesthood and manner of sacrifice. Still it cannot be said that this is entirely lacking in the Synoptic accounts. There is much to be said in favour of the remark of Vacher Burch on Mk.12:1-10 "Jesus makes the temple subject to Himself in His message..... both/

1. "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age", p.448 (foot note) see p.446, where he indicates the resemblance of Law in James to the attitude of Jesus.

2 See W.L.Knox: "St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem", (Ch.1) He indicates the common moral tone of the two Epistles.

both the prophetic and the ritual phases of Judaism are put aside by the profoundest form of anti-Judaism, the truth Jesus came to proclaim¹. It is doubtful if the anti-Judaism which this writer ascribes to Jesus can be seriously entertained along the lines he suggests in his book, but at any rate Mark 12 points to a note in the attitude of Jesus to the whole of Judaism which differs from Synoptic teaching in general. It can scarcely be doubted that in this chapter and the corresponding passages in Matthew and Luke, Jesus is challenging not only Rabbinism as the Synoptics represent him doing throughout his ministry, but His challenge includes the Temple hierarchy, the guardians of the sacrificial system. Goguel regards the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus as an attack upon the whole system of Judaism, and the saying of our Lord regarding² the destruction of the Temple as a denial of its entire usefulness. A fuller justification of this view will be given later.³ It is sufficient to observe here that behind the accounts of the evangelists lies a tradition which supports the contention of our Epistle: that Christ abolished the Levitical system.

Thus in the author's use of idealism, his doctrine of the person of Christ and in this last case his attitude to the Law, we have not a new theological speculation, but a reproduction of an authentic tradition of primitive Christianity. Further cases in point will be given in chapter V. These/

1. "Jesus Christ and His Revelation", p.47.
2. "La Vie de Jésus", p.387.
3. See ch.lX. pp.164-168, where Jesus' relation to the Temple Cult is discussed.

These may be taken as in part justifying the position we are taking in the present study: that the Epistle to the Hebrews is not only repeating Christian tradition at some points, as scholars contend, but he is reproducing it at almost every point. Again the practical purpose, which the writing is seen to serve, is not affected by the author introducing new theological ideas and^a peculiar Gnosis on scripture, but by insisting upon the fundamental tenets of their "Confession". These he interprets and explains; they become new in the sense that they become more intelligible to his readers, but not in the sense that the readers have never before heard of these principles.

The above position is confirmed to a degree by modern scholarship which has insisted upon the practical purpose of the writer and his apparent dependence for some of his ideas upon primitive tradition,¹ but its reluctance to granting a much more complete dependence is, as we have seen, due to the belief that the main doctrine of the Epistle, the priesthood of Christ and particularly its Melchizedek association, is a new and unheard of doctrine.

Consequently the chief point of our investigation will be the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. The opinion that this doctrine belongs to an early and reliable Christian tradition, obtains support from many scholars; yet as far as we can discover no attempt has been made to show how, and when, and/

1. McGiffert: "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age", p.471, contends most strongly for this view of the Epistle.

Chapter 11

and for what reason, it arose and that so early as to become part of a primitive Christian "Confession". It has been taken for granted that there is no definite authority for it in the life and teaching of Jesus; and if originating independently of our Epistle, then it was due merely to later reflection upon His person and work. The objection which has been taken to the term Gnosis, as used by Scott and Windisch, to characterize the Epistle's association of the priesthood of Christ with the Old Testament figure Melchizedek, is only legitimate providing this association has been made for the first time by our author. That such is the case is by no means proven. Our contention is, that this Christian doctrine of Christ's priesthood was in the first place based upon and derived from, the corresponding doctrine in Jewish literature of the priesthood of the Messiah. The priest-king conception, out of which the Messianic belief originated, was always thought of in the manner of the Epistle as "after the order of Melchizedek". Though the doctrine of Christ's priesthood which is implied in other late New Testament writings, does not hint at its association with this ancient figure it is extremely probable that it has¹ the same origin.

Moreover our object is to estimate the probability that the doctrine arose not so much by reason of the early Church's reflection upon the significance of Christ's person and work which became expressed in terms borrowed from Jewish Messianic literature./

1. The existence of the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchizedek among certain writing of the Church Fathers is discussed in Ch.IV

literature. Plausible as such a theory is, still we believe that there is evidence to be drawn from our sources of the life of Jesus, particularly the latter part of His ministry, which show that the impulse to think of Him as High-Priest after the order of Melchizedek, came in the first place from Jesus Himself.

Dr Wuttke expresses the generally accepted view of the origin of the doctrine in "Hebrews" to this effect:

"The Melchizedek text rests wholly upon the Philonic logos doctrine....the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews lighted upon the Melchizedek exegesis, seized it, then interpreted it in his own way - freely and in the manner of religiously experienced historical fact."

This it is believed is challengeable, on the evidence⁽¹⁾ of the Epistle itself, (2)^{of} the importance and influence of the doctrine in Jewish thought, (3)^{of} the suggestions of a doctrine of the priesthood of Christ in other New Testament writings, (4)^{of} the reasonable probability that it was occasioned by some definite teaching and gesture of the historic Jesus.²

1. "Melchizedek der Priesterkönig von Salem "Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese, von Gottfried Wuttke, 1927, p.11.
2. The author of "Hebrews" does not appeal to the authority of Jesus for this doctrine any more than he does for the other doctrines he makes use of, still this is no proof that he is totally unaware that Jesus might have taught or implied the doctrine.

AN EXEGESIS OF KEY PASSAGES.

It is felt that so much depends upon the author's implication in Ch.3:1, for a correct understanding of the Epistle that it can be said to provide the key to almost all the problems which the Epistle presents. At any rate it should aid in the solution of our main problem, the Priesthood of Christ. The writer speaks of the high Priesthood of Christ for the first time in 2:17. Westcott speaks of the introduction of the title at this point as "abrupt" conveying the notion that it does not follow the natural sequence of the writer's thoughts,¹ but this notion cannot be seriously entertained in view of the evident unity it has with the context vrs.10-18. It has again been contended that the writer is guilty of a rhetorical trick of subtly conveying the idea to his readers at the outset, without calling particular attention to it, in order that when he comes to deal with the doctrine their minds will already have a certain familiarity with the idea.² Both are roundabout ways of explaining how the writer could so casually use an expression, without further qualification, which it is assumed the readers are hearing for the first time applied to Christ. All this seems quite unnecessary and indeed unwarrantable.

There is no break in the development of the thought between the closing verse of Ch.2 and the opening of Ch.3, though our arbitrary division of chapters might suggest that the author is commencing/

1. Commentary, "Hebrews", p.57

2. A.B.Bruce: "The Epistle to the Hebrews" p.182.

commencing a new train of thought. 3:1 completes the thought of the preceding section and serves as introductory to his contrast of Moses with Jesus (3:5,6). *ὅθεν* may refer to the total characterization of Christ given in Chs.1 and 2, but it may only have been used to gather up the ideas in 2:9-18.

Wherefore seeing that Christ has entered into such sympathy with human needs and through His death procured men's salvation,

κατανοήσατε, regard well, τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα. In other words, the thought appears to be: therefore because this same Jesus whom we have spoken of just now as having taken on human form (2:14) and by His death made reconciliation for the people (2:17), is the *ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν* direct your gaze on him. Westcott however translates,

κατανοήσατε, in an entirely different sense: "The sense is not simply to regard Jesus who was, but regard Jesus as being."¹

However, this rendering meets with little approval among other scholars (Lunnemann, Davidson, Moffatt, Windisch, Wickham),

A.B.Bruce and J.F.McFadyen follow Westcott. *ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα* is usually regarded as referring to the twofold office of Moses and Aaron being united in Christ, but Dods offers an even more plausible explanation, "the frequent use of *ἀπόστολος* by our Lord to denote the Father's mission of the Son, authorizes the present application of *ἀπόστολον*". Lunnemann thinks it refers back to that which the writer has treated in Chs.1:1-2:4. But it is far from clear that he has any of these in mind. If such is his implication then he is crediting his readers with more understanding at this point than he does later on in the Epistle (5:11). In/

1. Ibid.supra. p.74.

In mentioning, "ἄπὸστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα", he is not expecting the readers to understand the sense in which he uses them from anything else which he has said apart from the phrase with which they are connected "τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν." His use of the article τόν shows the unity of idea in the clause and indicates its self-explanatory nature. Certainly the writer may have various connotations of the term ἄπὸστολος in mind, but its immediate reference is the important one both for him and his readers, and as he uses it here, that reference is to τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν. So with, ἀρχιερέα, it may contain an allusion to 2:11, 17, but the readers are not to understand it from any other than its immediate allusion to ὁμολογίας. Neither is it clear that any antithesis to Moses is implied in ἀρχιερέα, that is to make unnecessarily difficult a term which our author regarded as simply comprehended. Philo invests Moses with high-priestly honour, but as Prof. Moffatt attests "this idea is never prominent and is never worked out in Hebrews"¹. Our text may refer to a known doctrine: τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν which A.S. Peake renders "'of our confession'" and remarks: "If so, the readers already confess Jesus as high priest and this is not a truth taught them in the Epistle for the first time."² τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν cannot be resolved into ὃν ὁμολογοῦμεν without doing violence to the essential intention of the language. Hence it is not ὃν ὁμολογοῦμεν 'whom we confess' in opposition to the pre-Christian or Mosaic confession. The emphasis is not necessarily upon ἡμῶν though there may be a contrast implied since he proceeds in 3:2 - 4:14, to speak of two/

1. "Hebrews" I.C.C. p.42.
2. Century Bible "Hebrews" p.114.

two dispensations. But there is no reason to think with Moffatt and Westcott that *τῆς ἐκμολογίας ἡμῶν* can only refer to an indefinite abstraction which the author makes from his conception of the Christian faith having its full and final revelation in Christ, just as Judaism had in Moses. His objective use of the word attests that what he has in mind and what he exhorts his readers to fix their attention upon, is some of the contents of a known document in which the Christian faith is set forth. Windisch writes of the phrase: "It is an expression of a written avowal, in which the traditions and expectations of redemption are expressed to the community (cf. Tim. 6:12)". And though Windisch asserts that no further information is given except that the subject was Jesus Christ the Redeemer and His guaranteed redemption, we believe that even more explicit information than that is furnished by the verse. For as has been indicated Jesus, *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* *καὶ ἑπιστάτης*,² was mentioned in that "confession". That such² is the meaning the verse conveys, is suggested by A.B. Davidson,³ MacNeill,⁴ and Peake. Consequently we take the verse to mean: fix your attention firmly upon the apostleship and high priesthood of Jesus which is mentioned in our Confession of Faith.

Once it is conceded that this is the most acceptable interpretation, then we believe that its implications will be far-reaching for the total understanding of the Epistle. It is difficult/

1. Ibid. supra. p. 29. See also E.F. Scott: "The Epistle to the Hebrews", pp. 76, 171, and J.C. Lambert in an article, "Confession", D.C.G.
2. "The Epistle to the Hebrews" p. 106 (Handbook for Bible Classes).
3. H.L. MacNeill, ibid. supra. p. 106.
4. A.S. Peake: ibid. supra. p. 114.

difficult to understand why so many scholars, who agree to, or suggest, the legitimacy of this rendering, have omitted giving it the prominence it deserves in the study of the Epistle. It should be of the greatest importance in estimating the character and purpose of this writing. Indeed it seriously alters our whole conception of its character and purpose; and it re-emphasizes the practical end which the Epistle has been thought to serve.

It is a word of exhortation to hold fast the tenets of this Confession (4:14). Consequently it is difficult to understand it being characterized as a "theological speculation". This appears to be only applicable if the meaning of 3:1 is, as Nairne writes: "Consider him as high priest and I can make you understand"¹. The doctrine of the priesthood of Christ was apparently a prominent feature in their "Confession". At least the writer of the Epistle considers it to be the leading article in this early creed. He deems it of such importance, that it is upon it he builds his argument for the absolute worth and vital significance of Jesus Christ for men. The readers are men who have not fully comprehended the paramount value of the heritage left them by Christ. He proposes to instruct and enlighten them. He would explain in particular this doctrine of the priesthood of Christ which has been unmeaning to them. He regard it as embracing the whole plan of salvation. Once their eyes are opened to the full meaning and implication of this doctrine they can no longer think of falling away from faith, for the consequences/

1. Ibid.supra. p.300.

consequences are too great, once they are enlightened, (6:4-6).

It is necessary now to consider certain other passages which might be held to disprove the correctness of this exegesis.

4:14, at which point the Epistle is thought to resume its discussion of the priesthood of Christ should throw some light on the matter. *"ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερεῖς μέγαν σεληνιαθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, κατῴμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας"*.

The introductory phrase, *ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερεῖς*, appears to lead the thought back to 2:17, 3:1. However, it not only pre-supposes the mention of *ἀρχιερεὺς* in 2:17, 3:1 but since it adds the qualification *μέγαν* and *σεληνιαθότα*, these characteristics must be contained in what has preceded. It may be a resume of what has immediately preceded in 3:1-4:13. His mention again of *ὁμολογία* implies also that these qualifications belong to, or are inferable from, their "Confession". (It is to be noted that the "Confession" is alluded to, here, without any thought of contrast which is thought to be contained in *ἡμῶν*, (3:1)). The phrase *μέγαν ἀρχιερεῖς*, Moffatt and Westcott assume, he derives from Philo (de Somn.1.38). However, the author need only have had in mind Zech.3:8 in which the term *μέγας* is applied to the high-priest, Joshua. In any case the high priest, to whom their attention is directed here, is the one spoken of in the "Confession", (3:1). The thought clearly is: seeing that you (being Christians) have a great High Priest, who has passed through the Heavens, and who is spoken of in the "Confession", let us hold fast the "Confession".

This interpretation is consistent too with the conclusions of Prof. Windisch that "omologia" in all its occurrences (3:1, 4:14, 10:23)

implies a written avowal."¹ "μέγαν" and "ὁμολογία" are not to be regarded as being only inferable from the preceding argument (3:2-4:13), but they were either explicitly stated or immediately inferable from the "Confession". It is the sublime truth which is the content of the "Confession" which makes the holding fast of the "Confession" imperative. An explanation of the superiority and greatness of Jesus, spoken of in this document, is one of the reasons for his comparison of Jesus with Moses (3:3-6). The redeeming accomplishment of the heavenly High Priest must also have occupied a palace in the "Confession" in connection with His apostleship and priesthood; it engages the writer in the argument from "the Rest" unaccomplished by Moses and the first Joshua, and looked forward to by David (3:7, 4:13).

In 4:15 the writer proceeds with his explanation of the vital contents of their creed. It is the nature of the high priest, of their ὁμολογία, which is his next concern to lay before his readers. "οὐ γάρ", the negative form of the sentence seems to imply that there had been an objection on the part of the readers to the priesthood of Christ in the ὁμολογία, ^{and that} he is meeting ^{objection} this by a word of explanation and exhortation. That difficulty, he disposes of, in the succeeding verses (4:15 - 5:10). In the first place he stresses the human and sympathetic qualities of His priesthood as revealed in Jesus' life (vr.15); and then he draws a comparison with the Levitical order of priesthood (5:1-3). In 5:4-10 he continues his argument for the legitimacy of Christ's priesthood. And surely the argument is based upon the readers knowledge of the subject of Christ's priesthood./

1. Ibid.supra. p.29

priesthood. A.B.Bruce claims that the author in verses 4,⁵ subtly introduces the priesthood of Christ along with His Son-¹ship in the hope that the new idea will capture attention. Prof. Windisch ignores his assertion of the existence of a² written creed, and regards, both the doctrine of the priest-³hood and the argument with which the author sustains it, as purely an abstraction from Messianic texts. In both these ways scholarship has avoided the most obvious intention of the writer and branded him as an innovator and purely speculative theologian. If words are to have meaning at all, neither the motive of subtlety, nor that of the theological abstraction, can validly characterize the argument of our author in this⁴ section. The emphasis with which the author brings out in verse 4, "that no man taketh this honour unto himself", cannot have been spoken in defence of an abstraction, so much as in defence of a well-known doctrine of the Church. The cogency of this view is indeed enhanced further by the reference in verse 7, "who in the days of his flesh", where the author apparently had in mind a definite time of inception both into Sonship and Priesthood.. This appeal to the early life of Jesus is unnatural if the author is dealing with a doctrinal abstraction. In fact the whole passage warrants, not only our contention that it is a defence and explanation of a doctrine they already possess, but that Jesus had Himself made some such claim which the/

1. "The Epistle to the Hebrews" p.182.
2. Ibid.supra p.29.
3. Ibid.supra p.46
4. Moffatt remarks "no theological reflection upon the qualification of priests or upon the dogma of Messiah's sinlessness could have produced such a passage as this." p.65 I.C.C."Hebrews'.

the author is endeavouring to justify. This latter deduction, though inferable, is not necessarily involved in the proof of our main contention.

At this point it is well to review the opinion of scholarship upon our author's doctrine of the priesthood..Prof.Moffatt avers that the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ is vitally connected with his doctrine of the Sonship, and that somehow he derives the one doctrine from the other, and he writes: "This interpretation of the Son as Priest is a piece of g¹nosis."¹ However, for Professors Scott and Windisch, the priesthood of Christ in itself could scarcely be said to constitute the g²nosis, for they suggest that the priesthood of Christ may already be known. The g²nosis of the writer, for the latter scholars, consists rather in the arbitrary way in which the writer independently deduces the priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchizedek from scripture. It is this association of the priesthood of Christ with the order of Melchizedek from which we must determine the intention of the author and the whole character of his Epistle. The only type of Messianic priesthood known to this writer is that, "after the order of Melchizedek". Apparently from his first mention of Christ's priesthood it is that after this ancient order which he has in mind. Provided he obtains his doctrine solely from Gen.14:18 and Psl.110:4; then his doctrine of priesthood is unmeaning apart from these scriptures, from which scholars agree he derived it. Consequently, to/

1. Ibid.supra p.68.

2. Windisch: "der Hebraerbrief" p.46, Scott: "Epistle to Hebrews", pp.126,127.

to admit, as others besides Windisch and Scott do, that the suggestion of his great theme, the priesthood of Christ **may have been received by him** from primitive Christianity - and that it was not unknown to the readers - is tantamount to admitting that "after the order of Melchizedek" came with it, and it, too, was familiar to the Epistle's first readers. The cogency of this statement will be even more evident when we come to consider, at a later stage, how the priesthood of the Messiah in Jewish literature is never disassociated from the figure of Melchizedek.

We are to consider next the passage beginning at 5:10. Verses 6 and 10 are the first two points at which the author appeals directly to scripture for the proof of Christ's priesthood. Hitherto he has been content with simply stating the doctrine. It is to be noticed that he does not begin with scripture and then deduce his doctrine, but states the doctrine and then produces the scriptural proof. If he were deriving his doctrine from scripture solely, the process would surely have been the reverse. Verse 11, *Περὶ οὗ*, is regarded by most English commentators as referring to the whole subject of Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, others, including Windisch, take it to include only *τῆς Μελχισέκ*¹. In view of his later elaboration of the Melchizedek episode we take it to apply only to Melchizedek. There is a general agreement however that what the author is about to explain is new and difficult. Plainly the verse suggests the difficulty of his subject, /

1.

Ibid. supra, p.46. He writes: "Freilich ist die Bedeutung der *τῆς Μελχισέκ* Geheimnis, das genauer theologischer Erklärung bedarf".

subject, *σοφισμῆντος λέγειν, ὅτι νωθοὶ γέγοντε τῇς ἰκοῦς.*

This does not necessarily imply that the subject was new and unheard of hitherto. Taking the words at their face value, they simply express the difficulty of explaining a doctrine, the meaning of which they have imperfectly grasped - seeing that they are dull of hearing. One can agree with Windisch that *νωθοὶ τῇς ἰκοῦς*, indicates that "the danger of the community is a general religious lassitude - not a leaning to any false doctrine"¹. But one is compelled to disagree on the means which the writer adopts to dispel their lassitude. It is not by introducing them to a new and higher doctrine whereby he intends to accomplish this end, but by an explanation of "the first principles", (vr.12). *ἡ δὲ ἀρχαία* (Ver.12) is commonly thought to mean **advanced instruction, beyond the reach of ordinary** Christians; but the first Christian ideal according to Easton² was to equip every convert so completely that no one could specially deserve the title "teacher", that each member of the community should be a scribe instructed in the Kingdom of Heaven.² Conceivably if the qualification of the readers of Hebrews was lower than this early standard **as he implies they were,** it is unlikely that he would have burdened them with another new and peculiar doctrine not already accepted in the Church. Dr.R. Harris claims of this verse,

"It was a common anti-Judaic testimony and need not refer to any special weakness of the Church addressed or of the newness or difficulty of the subject to them; but simply means () as in the Testimony Book used by Justin (Dial.c 32), that the Jews cannot understand the scripture." ³

It/

1. Ibid.supra, p.47.
2. B.S.Easton: "Christ in The Gospels", see ch.11.
3. Harris and Burch: "Testimonies", p. 56. Vol II

It is in view of these various considerations that it is held that this passage also lends no support to the popular conception of the author's intention. His purpose is rather to elucidate a doctrinal principle contained in their "Confession" which he believes to be the heart of the Christian religion.

Chapter 6:1-3, is one of the most controversy-producing passages in the Epistle. Is the author's intention here to proceed to lead them on to a higher truth in spite of their dulness, or does ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερώμεθα merely enjoin them to advance to moral perfection? Commentators differ, Lunnemann¹ insists that it is an exhortation towards moral perfection. Many commentators agree that both the author's intention is advance towards both doctrinal and moral perfection (Westcott,² Moffatt,³ Dodds⁴), and base their conclusions not so much on the context as upon the assumption that the author's foregoing argument has hinted that such is his intention. But, however, the subsequent progress in the argument indicates that the exhortation has been obeyed, such intention of advance is clearly not expressed in verses 1-3.⁵ His intention is not so much advance as/

1. Commentary pp.225-233. Claims that had author meant perfection of doctrine he would have written ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα
2. Commentary pp.142,143 regards the verses as both a declaration of author's purpose and an exhortation to advance along with him to moral and doctrinal perfection.
3. Commentary pp.72,73, emphasizes the doctrinal advance which will involve a moral growth.
4. Commentary (Expositor's Greek) p.246, thinks that the authors will cease to speak of rudimentary and intends proceeding to what makes for an increase of knowledge and growth of character.
5. Peake "Hebrews" p.49 (The Century Bible).

as it is consolidation. In effect he writes:-

"leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ
(in the form expressed in our confession) let us
advance ~~to~~ perfect understanding and perfect
obedience to the same."

This interpretation is not based upon identifying "the principles
of the doctrine of Christ" with the βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆν.....

κρίματος αἰωνίου This identification is usually held to be the
factor which determines that the author's intention is not to
advance .But there is even stronger textual ground for this con-
clusion as to the author's intention : it is his identification
of both the doctrine of Christ's priesthood and the βαπτισμῶν διδασχῆν
with τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον both were in the ἐκμολογία¹ Wickham rightly
enough asserts that the intention of the author may be summed up
in the words: "let us not do anything beyond learning the
Catechism"². Thus it is to the contents of the "Confession"
that the author appeals in exhorting these half-hearted Chris-
:tians. They must grasp its import for them before it is too
late, and becomes "impossible to renew them again unto repent-
:ance", (6:6).

This purpose he proceeds to carry out in the argument
which follows. He immediately proceeds with a warning,
patently meaningless and irrelevant in an argument which pur-
:ports introducing the readers to a new doctrine, (6:4-8). It
passes over into a moving plea (6:9-12) and then an exhortation
based on scripture (13-19), ending by directing their gaze from
the/

1. Windisch "Hebräerbrief" p.49, agrees with this exegesis, but he
does not agree that the priesthood of Christ formed a part
of the statement of the doctrine of the person and work of
Christ.
2. Wickham: ibid.supra.p.39.

the article of the "Confession" which expresses their hope (verse 19) to the actual fact upon which this Christian hope rests (verse 20), to Him, "even Jesus, who as *ἱερόσπονος* entered within the veil, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek".

In Chapter 7, the author begins his explanation of this doctrine of the priesthood of Jesus after the order of Melchizedek, which thus far he has only spoken of as characterizing Christ's priesthood in the "Confession". This qualification of the priesthood of Christ he explains on the basis of Gen.14 and Psl.110:4. The readers will understand the vital significance of the doctrine when he has shown them from these passages the superiority of Christ's priesthood over that of the Levitic. The comment which he makes on the Melchizedek episode in Genesis (Heb.7:4-10) appears to be a justification of the author's own use of the expression "after the order of Melchizedek", and so too his comment on Psl.110:4 in verses 11-19. But the practical character of the whole epistle, and the context itself, indicates that he writes from another purpose here than that of defending his own use of an expression. It was not for the purpose of justifying a fanciful doctrine of his own creation that this chapter any more than any other was written. The painstaking care with which he points out the superiority of the Melchizedekian priesthood over the Aaronic, suggests that he is dealing with a problem which has already caused difficulty, and that, probably to these very readers. Everything points to the fact that the problem he is dealing with is a real one, and not merely a problem which his own fanciful/

fanciful speculation has created for him. The difficulty, towards which he directs his explanatory argument, exists in the mind of his readers. There is no support in this chapter, for the too common opinion, that the author is upon any such trifling business as defending and justifying a speculative theory of his own concerning the person and the work of Christ. The popular theory that the writer derives his whole doctrine of the priesthood of Christ from these two scriptural passages, goes to pieces on the very chapter dealing with the same. When Wuttke speaks of the whole chapter being the climax of an elaborate metaphysical speculation, he is basing his claim, not on the actual text but upon the assumption that the priest-¹hood of Christ was unknown until the author spied it in Philo-²a claim which we shall show to be lacking in warrant.

Again in 7:26-28 the author sums up briefly the quali-
ties of that priesthood which has been the burden of his
argument from 4:14. In verse 26^{he writes:} "for such an high priest
became us (fitted us)", and he proceeds to call to mind the
quality of Christ's priesthood (26-28). Once more he re-
capitulates (8:1) "Now of the things we have spoken^{κεφάλαιον}
cannot be translated 'this is the summary or sum'. That has
already been done (7:26 - 8:).". Moffatt and Westcott render
it "the point of all this" which also suggest the idea of a
summary, but as Peake observes the writer attempts no such
thing, passing directly to a new point.³ Peake on the matter
favours/

1. Wuttke "Der Priester-könig von Salem", p.11.
2. See the following chapter.
3. "Hebrews", The Century Bible pp.166,167.

favours a rendering of Field "now to crown our present dis-
¹
:course". Thus the meaning at once becomes, "the crowning
fact of that of which we have been speaking is: we have **an**
high priest (3:1; 4:14;10:21-23) who is set on the right hand of
the throne of God".

From this necessarily brief examination of the most
crucial passages in the author's treatment of his subject, it is
concluded that the priesthood of Christ as contained in the
homologias, is never out of the author's mind. It is the basis
of his theme, and not Gen.14:18- and Psl.110:4, which have value
only as they ^{are} the scriptural authority for the doctrine. It is
remarked by Wuttke that after chapter 7 no further appeal is
²
made to the figure of Melchizedek. **This fact is not so much an**
argument ¹ that the author had no further use for these
isolated passages of scripture, **as conclusive proof** is that
the doctrine of the priesthood had for the writer an independ-
:ent existence - it was an article of the Christian faith.

1. Ibid.p.167. See also Windisch: ibid.supra p.69.
2. Ibid.supra.p.8.



SOURCES OF THE EPISTLE'S MAIN IDEAS.

1. The Possibility of Philonic Influence.

The influence of Alexandrian thought upon the Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the pre-suppositions upon which all recent study of the Epistle has been made. There are no doubt striking resemblances of ideas and language which scholars have been justified in regarding as being due either to direct dependence upon the text of Philo or at least to the influence of the Alexandrine training which the author has had. However, there appears to be a growing tendency on the part of some to minimize the possibility of direct influence from Philo;¹ and even to deny any influence whatever.²

Siegfried finds many resemblances to Philo in form: the habit of putting in educational sections; certain similarities in their use of scripture, indicated in an indefiniteness of citation; similarities in oratorical comparisons and climaxes; a similar method of abandoning the historical meaning of a text because of its self-contradiction; the use made of the silence of scripture.³ Again he finds resemblances in their theological views; the logos doctrine, their cosmology, their view of faith; a certain agreement in their teaching on the efficacy of sacrifice.⁴ He also discovers/

1. Scott: "Epistle to the Hebrews", pp.50-58.
2. See Article by R.Harris, Expos.Times, XXXV11, p.565.
3. Siegfried: "Philo von Alexandria", pp.321-323.
4. Ibid. pp.324-326

discovers likenesses in their mode of expression and use of
¹
 certain phrases.

These indicate at least an outward similarity and, as Siegfried asserts, they do not amount to proof that our author had read Philo. But there is certainly a formidable weight of opinion in favour of viewing Philo as the indirect source of the author's main ideas. The case would be proven if it were not for certain other well enough known considerations. In the first place there is the fact that Philo's teachings² were about contemporary with those of Christ, which reduces the possibility of influence. Secondly, there are reasons for regarding the resemblances as due to general conditions of religious culture among Palestinian Jews. Bréhier confirms that opinion in showing that the exegesis of Philo³ is based to some extent upon Palestinian. The occurrences of a few scattered resemblances of thought cannot prove a relation or dependence, but only if it can be shown that the phrases and sentiments appealed to are more of a Philonic cast than those to be found in Palestinian literature. Now the main difference which scholars have found to exist between Philo and the Jewish Wisdom literature is the absence in the latter of speculative philosophy and Greek culture.⁴ And it is this same difference which exists between the Epistle to the Hebrews and Philo's writings.

The/

1. Ibid. pp.328,329.
2. See H.A.A.Kennedy: "Philo's Contribution to Religion".p.6. He dates Philo's birth about 20 B.C., and his death some time after 41 A.D.
3. "Des Idées Philosophiques et Religieuses de Philon", pp.45-66. See also Drummond: "Philo Judaeus", p.12.
4. See Drummond ibid. p.150.

The opening verses of the Epistle have such a striking resemblance to the Philonic logos doctrine that they have been regarded at once as showing Alexandrian influence and even dependence on Philo.¹ This, though nowhere in the Epistle is Christ definitely described by the term 'logos'. In Heb.1:3 the words: "effulgence of glory and express image",² appears to be an exact quotation from Philo, but the phrase also occurs in ^{the} Wisdom of Solomon,³ which is almost certainly independent of Philo.⁴ Siegfried compares all these passages, and concludes that dependence upon Philo is almost certain, if it were not for the fact that the activity of the general figure of logos in Philo is metaphysical; whereas in the Epistle, the word of God is primarily ethical. The correspondence of thought and expression between our Epistle and the Jewish Wisdom literature is in every way as close as it is to Philo,⁵ i.e. in Ecclesiasticus XXIV: 1-4, "God having created it from the olden time (αὐὶ ὥρων). Again in Wisdom of Solomon (1X:9),⁶ Wisdom was present with God when He made the universe (Gressmann is of the opinion that the idea of the man pre-existing in the Heavens was known earlier than Daniel.⁷ He thinks that even Deutero-Isaiah had a like thought).⁸ Wisdom's presence with God and part in creation was/

1. All quotations from Philo are made from C.D.Young's translation of Philo Judaeus (Bohn Classical Library 4 vols).
2. Cf.Heb.1:3 with "Creation of World", Ll (1.p 43).
3. Cf.Heb.1:3 and Wisdom of Solomon, 7:25,26.
4. Ibid.supra, pp.325,326.
5. See Drummond:"Philo Judaeus" Vol.11, p.150.
6. See also Sirach 24:9 cf.Prv.1:20.
7. "Der Ursprung der Israelitisch - Jüdischen Eschatology", pp.336-349.In Dan.7:18f. Messiah descends from Heaven.
8. "Der Messias", p.339.

was an idea indigenous to Palestinian Judaism, and frequently occurs in the Pseudepigrapha.² So far as the idea of pre-existence is inferable from the Epistle or the idea of Christ's part in creation is concerned,³ the author need only be dependent upon native Palestinian thought.

But the chief obstacle to thinking our author independent of Philo is the resemblance in their use of the Melchizedek episode (Gen.14:18), and the idea of ^{the} logos as High-priest. Most modern students of the Epistle grant that nearly all his ideas can be found in Palestinian Judaism, but all make exception of his exegesis of Gen.XLV:18. Philo identifies a number of Old Testament figures with the logos, Moses, Melchizedek and Aaron. Before considering the high-priestly function of logos in relation to any one of these figures it is interesting to notice the characteristics of Philonic high priesthood. It is a point which has not been given sufficient, if any, attention by those who estimate our Epistle's relation to Philo. The description runs thus:

"God commands the High priest neither to rend his clothes.....he may show himself superior to pity, and pass the whole of his life exempt from sorrow. For the law designs that he should be partaker of a nature superior to that of man....".⁴

Such a conception of high priesthood is the very antithesis of what we find in the Epistle, (cf.Heb.5:2,7) Verse 4:

"touched/

1. In the Targum of Pseudo-Jon. on Is.XLV:12, the Memra is the agent of God in the creation of the world. See Oesterley: "Jewish Doctrine of Mediation", pp.87 ff.
2. Similitudes^{of Enoch} 48:3; 48:6; Apoc. Bar. 4:3; 59:4; Ass.Moses 1:14,17; 4th Ezra 13:26-30.
3. Cf.Heb.3:4, "God who made all things".
4. On Monarchy 11, x11 (111, p.201).

"touched with a feeling of our infirmities"...."compassion on the ignorant"...."compassed with infirmity....supplications with strong crying and tears".

Turning now to the Melchizedek passages, Philo writes of his priesthood: "who had received a self-instructed and self-taught priesthood"¹. Again "Melchizedek the righteous king of Salem", gives instruction how men may have a good voyage through life, "being steered by the good artificer and pilot" who is "right reason". Melchizedek also brings forward wine and gives drink to souls, "for reason is a priest having self-existence and entertaining high and magnificent thoughts about him"². Moreover, Philo speaks of Melchizedek: "Who then is the chief butler of God? The Priest who offers libations to Him, who having received a draught of everlasting graces, offers himself in return pouring in an entire libation full of unmixed wine.....But the high priest of whom we are speaking is a perfect man,³ the husband of a virgin."

What we find in these passages has certainly nothing in common with the doctrine of priesthood in the Epistle.

Siegfried has made a comparison of other passages in which he finds resemblances, but of which he writes: "it will be most natural ..to regard the whole idea of the epistle to the Hebrews regarding the operation of the Word as raised upon the foundation of the Philonic(idea). Individual differences are not thereby denied."⁴ It is those differences which exist

1. Treat.on Instruction, XV111 (11.p.177.).
2. Alleg.Laws. Bk.11,26 (1.pp.128,129).
3. "Dreams", Bk.11,27 (11.p.376) A very peculiar idea.
4. Ibid.supra.p.326.

between the Philonic text and the Epistle together with the incongruous elements just mentioned, which make the assumption of our author's dependence upon Philo a very dubious one. The term 'archiereus' is never applied to Melchizedek by Philo.¹ Neither is the priestly duty of logos ever thought of as that of making intercession. Philo speaks of the 'suppliant' logos which Drummond affirms is a Greek word which never denotes anything more than intercession on his own behalf, he is an ambassador but not an intercessor.² When Philo speaks of Moses, Aaron and Melchizedek as high priestly representatives of logoi they are never conceived as having personality, they are merely allegorical identifications.³ All this is in the region of abstract ideas and there is nothing of this in the Epistle; "The high priest is not a man but divine reason which arrays itself in the cosmos as a garment and in lives in the soul as a judge".⁴ At times Philo speaks of the unity of the high priest with the cosmos rather than the logos.⁵ The dress of the high priest Reason is made to symbolize the several constituent elements of the universe.⁶ One can think of nothing which is further from the thought of the Philonic logos than the high priest in our Epistle, "who in the days of His flesh.....".

Just/

1. Windisch *Ibid. supra.* p.46, affirms that neither in Philo the LXX nor Josephus is Melchizedek called 'archiereus'
2. *Ibid. supra.* p.237. See "Sacr. Abel and Cain", XXXVI (11. p.235). Reason is here called Levite. Also "Heir of Divine Things", XLII (11. p.134).
3. *Migr. Abr.* XI V (11 p.60)
4. On Fugitives XX (11 p.216)
5. Life of Moses, Bk. III. XI V (111. p.102) and Bk. II Monarchy VI (111. pp.196, 197).
6. *Migr. Abr.* XV III (11. p.66).

Just as the pre-existent and creative activity of Messiah are in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal literature of Palestine - which like Hebrews stresses the ethical rather than the metaphysical - so the priesthood of Christ has some parallel in these same writings, (i.e. in Ecclesiasticus (XXIV:6-11) "accordingly she ministered in the Holy Tabernacle, and was established in Zion, in Jerusalem the beloved city".¹ The mediating function which has been exercised by religious leaders on earth is thought of as being continued in heaven.² There was current in Palestinian Judaism the idea of Michael³ as the merciful high priest of the heavenly high priesthood. In Tobit XII:15, angels present the prayers of the saints.⁴ In 2 Mac.15:1-15, Judas Maccabaeus had a vision in which he sees Onias, formerly a high priest, praying for the Jews. Oesterley cites numerous examples from the Targums in which "Memra" is represented as Israel's intercessor before God.⁵ For example, in the Targum of Pseudo-John on Deut.4:7, "the Memra brings Israel nigh unto God and sits on His throne receiving the prayers of Israel. This distinctively Jewish doctrine of an intercessor was accepted and recognized by the early Apostolic Church. Charles calls attention to its use in Mt. XXV11:47,49: Lk.XV1:24: John 8:56: Heb.12:1: Rev.6:9-11.⁶

Our/

1. In the same way Sirach 24: 4-10.
2. Cf. Eccus.7:8,9, with Heb.4:14-16, 7:25.
3. See Enoch.LXV11: 3,4. 1 Esd.8:34; Buchanan Gray: "Sacrifice in the Old Testament", p.185. He suggests that the author of Hebrews may have had this figure in mind.
4. Cf.Tobit 3:16,17.
5. "The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation", pp. 87 ff.
6. See foot note to 2 Mac.15 in Vol.11 "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha".

Our author's use of the idea of the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly has also led to the assumption¹ that he is dependent upon Philo who has the same thought. But Philo himself had derived it from a long established Palestinian usage. Harnack writes:

"According to the theory held by the ancient Jews and by the whole of the Semitic nations, everything of real value that from time to time appears on earth has its existence in heaven".²

Our author need only be making use of an idea long current in Judaism. It is deemed unnecessary to indicate any further correspondence between "Hebrews" and Palestinian Judaism. For some time there has been a well established opinion among scholars that most of the ideas in the Epistle of a Philonic complexion need have no other origin than native Judaism. As we have noticed, about the one and only element in the Epistle which cast the balance in favour of direct or indirect Philonic dependence, was their mutual use of Gen.XIV:18. If not only his ideas, but also the moral and practical religious tone of his use of those ideas are decidedly Palestinian, it is surely more plausible to expect that the author is also dependent upon the same source for the Melchizedekian high priesthood. And there is in the Epistle some evidence that points to that conclusion.

It is extremely doubtful if Philo ever identifies Melchizedek with the Messiah. He never uses Psl.110:4,³ but/

1. "On Dreams", 1.XXX11 (111.p.331) cf, Heb.9:23
2. "History of Dogma", Vol.1 p.318.
3. Windisch: *ibid.* supra. writes: "Ps.109:4 ist dabei das Leitmotiv der ganzen Betrachtung gewesen", p.62.

but it is just this Psalm which throughout the major portion of the Epistle is the basis of his argument, and not Gen.XIV, which comes in as a commentary upon all he has been saying, (Heb.7:1 -). It is the Messianic Psalm which is the clue to the real source of his thought. Though the priestly function of Christ dominates his theme, his kingly office is not forgotten. Prof.Moffatt confirms this view when he writes: "He repeatedly endeavours to preserve something of the primitive view of Jesus as Messianic King."¹ But it is not the old military Messianic category, as Prof.Moffatt thinks, which is thus preserved, but rather the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal contained in the Psalm. The opinion is often expressed that the writer's introduction of the kingly office as he does, is out of place. As a matter of fact, there is nothing incongruous in his use of it in the Epistle; it is the very essence of the ancient Messianic ideal which is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews: a priest-kingly Messiah "after the order of Melchizedek".² This will become more evident when we come to consider the importance of the priest-kingly idea in Jewish Messianic expectation.

SUMMARY:

The classification of the Epistle as Alexandrian is only legitimate in so far as it reveals the use of thought forms and rhetorical methods which we have come to speak of as Alexandrian. Native Judaism exhibited, either through development of latent ideas or absorption of Hellenistic categories/

1. I.C.C."Hebrews", p.xxxiii.

2. Cf.Heb.1:8, 13; 2:8,9; 5:6,10; 8:1; 12:2.

categories, just those religious values which our author embodies in his Epistle almost unaltered, but which Philo adapted to Greek metaphysics. Indeed our author may have been aware of the use which Philo had made of these same ideas, but there is no conclusive evidence of even this from the Epistle. The one is inspired by his master Plato to reinterpret Judaism, the other is inspired by his Master Jesus Christ to set forth the universal and eternal value inherent in the New Covenant instituted by the historic Jesus.

2. The Source of the "Priesthood after the order of Melchizedek."

The fact that there is no trace of a Melchizedekian cult prior to the writing of Hebrews, and the further fact that the Epistle appears to use the expression without any polemical motive, has led to a common conclusion among scholars that our Epistle is the source of the later gnostic¹:al speculations about Melchizedek. This has led at once to the further assumption that all alike can be traced to Philo. We do not believe that the matter is by any means so easily settled. Indeed it is far from evident that "Hebrews" can be taken as the starting point of the interpretations which grew up in Gnostic literature and which later/

1. "The Pistis Sophia", translated by George Horner, 1924. The references are to the pages of his translation. F. Legge who has written the preface thinks that the first document **is one of** the earliest Christian writings of the Apostolic age, and that the main ones belong to the school of Valentinus (p.lv). Horner is of the opinion that the first and part of the second were written by Valentinus and can be dated before A.D. 160 (p.xlviii). Cf. Burkitt "Church and Gnosis", pp.66,67.

later Church Fathers combatted, by calling to their aid the Epistle. They doubtless all have common Christian origin, and upon that common origin our author is also dependent - and his source, as we have seen, is other than the writings of Philo.

The Pistis Sophia documents at once witness to the writer's¹ ignorance of the subject of the Priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchizedek. In the documents Jesus speaks of Melchizedek but there is no thought of identifying Jesus and this figure.² No use at all is even made of Gen.14 and Psl.110. Only the name Melchizedek is borrowed and in one instance associated with that of Zoroaster.³ Whatever traditional associations of Jesus with Melchizedek, if any, underlie such speculations it is certainly not that of the Epistle.

Can the figure in Pistis Sophia and "Hebrews" depend upon a purely Jewish speculation about Melchizedek? There is nothing corresponding to it in the Talmud - most of which is too late to have influenced any first century writings. Though/

1. Wuttke: "Der Priester-könig von Salem" 1927, p.1, writes: "Darüber kann Zweifel sein, dass die Gestalt des priester-königs von Salem aus Gen.14,....versunken wäre oder eine nur sehr geringe Zugkraft für das Interesse gebildet hätte, wenn sie nicht in einem neutestamentlichen Briefe..." p.1. So Windisch: ibid.supra p.62. "Nur ein vorchristlicher Melchizedekskultus gegen den Hebr polemisieren sollte, ist nicht nachzuweisen".....So haben erst christlichen Leser und Ausleger des Hebr die Melchizedekspekulation weitergetrieben und, die Konsequenzen aus den Werfänglichen Aussagen in 3 .of.ziehend, einen Melchizedekskultus gelehrt".
2. Pistis Sophia 1, pp.11-19, 11.96, 111.146, 1V.196, characterized by "Melchizedek the Receiver of Light".
- 3 Ibid.p.184.

Though Windisch affirms that the Epistle cannot be regarded as independent of Philo in this use of the figure of Melchizedek, nevertheless he suggests the possibility of another source when he writes:

"er wird aber ähnliche exegetische Traditionen gekannt haben, die er seinen besonderen Zweck^{en} dienstbar gemacht hat, die Überlegenheit des Priesters Christus über Levi und Aaron nachzuweisen". 1

He refers to similar traditions to those in Slavonic Enoch, but as will be seen, when we come to consider this Jewish writing, the original Jewish text contained no such speculation. The only approach to the Epistle's doctrine of priesthood is 53:1 where Enoch is standing before God and praying² for the people's sins, and in 33:10, "Enoch my intercessor". These like the passages noticed in other Wisdom writings would account for much in the Epistle; but scarcely for the gnostical speculations, for Melchizedek is not even mentioned. The absence of any such speculations in Jewish writings points to a Christian source for the Pistis Sophia, and that source is earlier than "Hebrews".

If a first or at latest a second century Christian gnostical speculation has independently of "Hebrews" introduced the figure of Melchizedek in association with Jesus, then both our author and that of Pistis Sophia are either dependent on a purely Jewish source - of which there is no trace - or they are dependent on a common Christian tradition in which the names Jesus and Melchizedek are associated. Their difference can possibly be explained on the basis of some common Christian tradition, /

1. Ibid. supra. p. 61.

2. References are to the text of "Slavonic Enoch" in Vol. 2 "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha", R.H. Charles.

tradition, but it is too great to think that there has been¹ dependence upon the text of "Hebrews".

Again in Epiphanius we learn of further developments of the gnostical speculations on Melchizedek. Here it is "Hebrews" chapter 7, which is used as argument against these heresies, but there is nothing in the text which indicates that the heresies were in the first place based upon the Epistle to the Hebrews. Their error, the writer claims, is evident from scripture:

"Verum ex ipsis Scripturae verbis facile est istorum errorem convincere. Quod enim de Domino a Davide pronuntiatum est, cum sacerdotem illum secundum ordinem Melchizedek fore praedixit, una et Christi sacerdotium iisdem est illis consignatum. Ac statim illud a divo Paulo subjectum legitur: Assimilatus, Filio Dei manet sacerdos in perpetuum".²

But nowhere does he suggest that these speculations have their source in the text of the Epistle. Indeed the variety of Melchizedekian cults which Epiphanius records have nothing in common with the Epistle which is the point of much of his argument. Epiphanius knows of those who contended that Melchizedek was "Christo Majorem esse" (55:1:2). Through later controversy the cults doubtless, and as is instanced by Epiphanius, did appeal to the Epistle for a substantiation³ of their claim. But the original association of Christ with Melchizedek need not and plainly is not derived from the Epistle. Windisch indicates the apparent incongruity of these/

1. For comparisons see foot note on p.62.
2. Haeres' 55:9,11 (Patr.tomus 1 p.988).
3. Haeres' 67:3 (Patr.Tomus 11. p.175).

these heresies with the teaching of the Epistle, and asserts that they can scarcely have Christian origin. However, we believe that there is some evidence of their having a Christian origin and that their source was a somewhat similar tradition ²to that upon which the author of "Hebrews" is dependent.

Wuttke discusses the place of Melchizedek in the Apocrypha of Athanasius where the most extraordinary tale is told. Melchizedek provokes the anger of the Father God of creation and is doomed to be sacrificed to the gods. By chance he is saved and on the Mount of Olives where he can view the feast of sacrifice, he prays to God and suddenly a great earthquake destroys Salem.³ This mixing of legend with the Christian traditional site of Jesus' agony and prayers is very strange, but is it more likely to have its origin in the Epistle's use of the Melchizedek episode than in some parallel Christian tradition which has been exploited in the interests of a fantastic-cult speculation? Indeed there is evidence that the episode in the ^hPascal Chronicle is based upon other Christian tradition than that of the Epistle. Wuttke, who takes it for granted that "Hebrews" is the starting point of all this speculation, finds nothing to identify it with our author's use. It is based entirely upon Genesis 14. Furthermore he suggests that the Christian traditional/

1. Ibid.supra.p.63 "das mit den sonstigen Lehren des Hebr nicht ganz in Einklang steht und kaum christlicher Herkunft ist".
2. See Ch.IX of this treatise.
3. Ibid.supra.p.39.

traditional equation of Jesus and Melchizedek may be traced to Jesus Himself. Referring to Jesus' mention of the Melchizedek episode in John 8:56-59, he writes:

"Wenn Jesus davon redet, dass Abraham seinen Tag gesehen habe, dann kann nur die Melchisedec-Szene gemeint sein". 1

Had Wuttke followed up this single clue to the origin of these later gnostical speculations he might have seen that the case for basing all upon the use of the episode in "Hebrews" is far from credible. The writer of the Fourth Gospel embodied in his gospel a Christian traditional association of Jesus with Melchizedek which, in view of the divergence of later Melchizedek speculation from the Epistle, is more likely to be the common source of all this later reflection as seen in the Pistis Sophia, the heresies mentioned by Epiphanius and Hypolytus the Paschal Chronicle and Slavonic Enoch.

2

This last document, the Slavonic Enoch, in its original Jewish form did not contain the Melchizedek speculation. Charles shows it to be absent from most of the MSS, and regards it as the work of an early Christian heretic. Though there are points of identity with the Christian infancy narratives (111:23; 1V:4,8), there is no naming of Jesus. The allusions to the priesthood of Melchizedek might account for its use in the Epistle, but it clearly cannot have been derived therefrom. Windisch confirms the possibility of a parallel Christian tradition, being the source of the Epistle's/

1. Ibid. supra. p. 39.

2. "Book of the Secrets of Enoch" (Oxford 1896) Charles adds this fragment in the Appendix. See pp. 85-86.

Epistle's use of the episode. Referring to this fragment he writes:¹ "Nicht aus dieser, aber aus paralleler tradition wird Hebr. geschöpft haben". What those parallel Christian traditions are he does not suggest, but as we have seen John 8:56-59 is just such a parallel. The passage in the Enoch² fragment, as translated by Charles, is:

"And from my race shall rise up many people and Melchizedek shall be the chief of the priests, among the people, ruling alone and serving thee O Lord. Because I had not another child in this family, who might be a great priest, but this son of mine..... and Melchizedek shall be the head over twelve priests who lived before and at last shall be the head over all, being the great high priest, the Word of God, and the power to work great and glorious marvels above all that have been".

Charles regards this (111:34) as one of the passages which betray Christian authorship of the fragment. It is idle to make any conjecture as to its relation to Christian tradition. The allusion to the twelve priests is likely to the Apostles. There is also something of the atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel about his use of "Word of God" and the reference to the miraculous powers conferred upon Melchizedek. This, together with the saying attributed to Jesus in John 8:56, cannot be void of some significance in an estimate of the primitive Christian association of Jesus with Melchizedek or even of Jesus' own association of His Messianic role with the priest-king after the order of Melchizedek. At any rate the Fourth Gospel and these early heretical speculations contain some hint of the doctrine in the Epistle having a Christian source./

1. Ibid. supra p.62: He recognizes the fragment to be Christian and though he is not explicit, he must refer to a parallel Christian tradition in this statement.
2. 111:33,34.

source. Consequently, we are justified in our present studies in enquiring as to the possibility of a dependable early Christian tradition upon which both the Epistle and later speculation are based. About the only other evidence of the existence of such is that which is shown by a dominating and influential element in Jewish Messianism, together with certain striking facts which all four evangelists record of the historic Jesus. But between these primary sources and the Epistle, there lay a body of Christian tradition which identified Jesus with the Wisdom of God, made much of the scriptural analogies of Jesus and Joshua, of a New Covenant, a new priesthood and Temple, and which there is much reason to believe was the immediate source of our author's ideas.

These primitive Christian ideas, Dr. Rendel Harris¹ believes, were characteristic of a Book of Testimonies - that to which Papias makes reference as the logia of Matthew. The existence of such a collection of Old Testament prophecies has long been recognized. And, though Dr. Harris' conclusions as to its nature and extent of influence upon New Testament writings, and his theory that Jesus was² the first to make use of these anti-Judaic texts, is not generally accepted, there is no doubt that some such collection did exist in Apostolic times and may have been the handbook/

1. "Testimonies", Parts 1 and 2 by R. Harris assisted by Vacher Burch.
2. It is very doubtful if the extreme position which Vacher Burch takes on Jesus' Anti-Judaism can be said to apply to His whole ministry. See "Jesus Christ and His Revelation", V. Burch, London 1927, particularly Ch. 2.

handbook of the travelling evangelists. The main principles¹ of Dr.Harris' theory, of the existence and antiquity of a Book of Testimonies, we believe, have been established.² However, for some inexplicable reason none of the literature dealing with our Epistle within the last decade, has made the slightest reference to Dr. Harris' conclusions as to the dependence of the author of "Hebrews" upon the "Testimony Book". The light which his study of the Epistle, in relation to a collection of Testimonies, throws upon the origin and relation of its ideas to primitive Christianity deserves serious consideration. For our present purpose we need only call attention to a few of these conclusions in so far as they bear upon the contention of the character of the Epistle and the origin of its central doctrine.³

In the first place, he confirms our conclusions as to the non-Philonic origin of the ideas in the Epistle's prologue, when he writes:⁴

"The substance of the argument in these verses is built up out of the identification of Christ with the Wisdom of God.....this identification and description is the foundation stone of the 'Book of Testimonies'. In this sense the prologue is built up on submerged testimonies".

Here again our author, who has been accused of creating a new view/

1. See A.H.McNeile: "St.Matthew" p.xl; Burkitt: "The Gospel and its Transmission", p.127; Moffatt: "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament", p.34; Hatch: "Essays on Biblical Greek", p.203.
2. See article by J.A.Findlay: "The Book of Testimonies and the First Gospel", Expositor vol.XX, p.388. He produces two further instances of the use of the Testimony Book, p.214.
3. For Dr.Harris' full treatment of the Epistle in relation to the Testimony Book see "Testimonies", pp.43-57, also Expositor July 1919.
4. "Testimonies", part 11. p.43.

view of the Person of Christ, is merely following the traditional Christian categories which lay in the material he embodies in the Epistle.

Again Dr. Harris has indicated how the contrast of the Old and New Covenant, Jesus and the ancient Joshua, the mention of the new circumcision, the new priesthood, new Temple and new sacrifice, occur in Cyprian's testimonies against the Jews.¹ The Book of Testimonies, he declares,² is "the Book of origins of the Epistle to the Hebrews". From our study of the matter we believe that this is quite demonstrable. For our present purpose we shall examine the writings of the Church Fathers for the relation of their doctrine of the priesthood of Christ to that in "Hebrews".

It is quite significant that our author is apparently dependent upon a different version of the Genesis account of Melchizedek than is found either in the Hebrew text or the LXX. In Heb.7:3 there is added to Gen.14;18 the clause: "without father without mother.....". As to this, Hommel³ remarks: "apparently he was familiar with a version containing a supplementary clause somewhat to this effect; 'who had not received the Kingdom from his father or his mother'". The clause frequently comes into the arguments of the Church Fathers;⁴ and obviously points to a "Testimony" source.

The arguments for the priesthood of Christ in the Fathers/

1. See "The Writings of Cyprian", Vol.11, p.80. Treatise XII "Testimonies against the Jews", (Ante-Nicene Library).
2. Ibid.supra, p.44
3. "Ancient Hebrew Tradition", p.153.
4. Cf. Cyril of Alexandria, XXXIII, 2 (l.p.345) St. Augustine Tract. in Joann.8.

Fathers is in nearly every instance supported by scriptural proof texts in which Jesus is read for Joshua. The author of "Hebrews" has done likewise (4:8, cf. Josh. 22:4), but his doctrine of priesthood has little to do with this identification. With the Fathers, it is otherwise, for they make common use of the identification of Jesus with Joshua the great high priest of Zechariah¹, together with Gen. 14 and Psalm 110 in their argument for the doctrine. Our author probably has in mind the high-priest Joshua in 4:14, though it is not exactly the Greek of Zech. 3:8. This constitutes their main difference in the use of proof texts for the doctrine.

An examination of the priesthood of Christ passages in the Ante-Nicene Fathers reveals another important consideration: no reference is directly made to the Epistle in defending the doctrine, though usually the priesthood is thought of in association with Melchizedek. It is difficult to explain their scanty reference to the Epistle upon other questions, but this neglect of it when defending or maintaining the doctrine of Christ's priesthood is even more remarkable.² Justin Martyr writes: "I have proven that it was Jesus who conversed with Moses and Abraham.....this is He who is the Eternal King of Salem after the order of Melchizedek and the Eternal Priest of the Most High". This singular avoidance of mentioning the Epistle, when it would appear to have been most appropriate if the argument is in defence of a/

1. Zech. 3: 1.
2. Dial. with Trypho cxlxi (11 p. 241).

a doctrine which originated with our Epistle, is seen again¹
in Lactantius. His arguments run:

"And since Christ was the builder of the great and eternal Temple, He must also have an everlasting priesthood in it....David in the 110th Psalm teaches the same; 'Before the morning Star I begat Thee. Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek'. Also in the first Book of Kings: 'I will raise me up a faithful priest.....'".

He concludes with the quotation of the priesthood in the prophecy of Zechariah. Again in "The Writings of Cyprian" the two references, which he makes to the doctrine, point to a complete independence of "Hebrews". In the Dialogue with Trypho:

"Also in the priest Melchizedek we see prefigured the sacrament of the sacrifice of our Lord....For who is more a priest of God than our Lord Jesus Christ who offered a sacrifice to God the Father and offered the very same thing which Melchizedek had offered, bread and wine, to wit His body and blood".²

The real clue to the source of the ~~father's~~ doctrine lies in another passage from Cyprian. Here the argument takes the identical lines which it does in the passage quoted from³ Lactantius. The prophecy of a new Temple is followed by the Davidic prophecy of a new priest (1 Sam.2:35). Here Cyprian is simply discussing one of the heads of Testimonies which he has recorded at the beginning of Treatise XII. The subject of his disquisition on the priesthood is the Head number 17, which reads: "That the old priesthood should cease and a new priest should come who would be forever". It is a similar sequence of ideas that occurs in both Cyprian's argument for/

1. The Divine Institutes IV.14 (1.p.241).
2. Writings of Cyprian, Vol.1.lxxii.4 p.210.
3. Book IV.xvll, p.253.

for the priesthood and that of Lactantius. It is the¹ Testimony Head number 17 which both are discussing. Their argument for the doctrine is on entirely different lines from that of the Epistle, and ^{they} make no reference to its argument. The doctrine, so far as these writers are concerned, existed independently of "Hebrews". Their source certainly was some such collocation of Testimonies as those Cyprian has embodied in his Writings.

There is further evidence of the doctrine having a source other than the Epistle. Mention has been made of the extent to which the minds of the Church Fathers were exercised by the mention of the high priest Joshua in Zechariah. A study of these passages indicates that the Fathers are intent upon much the same object as is the author of "Hebrews", namely, the defending from misunderstanding or² misconstruction the doctrine of Christ's priesthood. The Fathers appeal to Zech.3:2,3, "And the Lord said unto Satannow Joshua was clothed with filthy garments". In "Hebrews" the devil stands to oppose the High Priest Jesus, "who was tempted in all points yet without sin". Here it is the Temptations of Jesus - although 4:14 has some likeness to the Greek of Zechariah -which the writer has in mind. He defends the purity of Christ's priesthood who needs no forgiveness of sins as the Levitical high priests. But the Fathers in defending an established doctrine of Christ's priesthood know of a difficulty in the conventional proof text/

1. Cf. Lactantius Book IV. xvll, p.253 with Cyprian: "Treatise Xll" (ii.p.90).
2. See article "The Sinless High Priest", Expos. Times xxxlll, p.217 ff.

text from Zechariah: "He was clothed with filthy garments". They make an attempt to get over the difficulty of the sinfulness of Joshua typified by the garments. Justin Martyr says: "We ourselves are the sinful figure here typified".¹ Tertullian claims that it is the indignity of the incarnation.² So in the Institutes of Lactantius the difficulty is met by explaining it in terms of the Incarnation: "He spoke therefore of Jesus the Son of God to show that He would first come in humility and in the flesh. For this is the filthy garment that He might prepare a Temple for God".³ As in Justin Martyr and Tertullian no mention is made of the doctrine in the Epistle or appeal to its authority. It is not sufficient reason for this neglect to say that the Epistle had a dubious authority at the time. The real reason was that the priesthood of Christ occupied a conspicuous place in an Apostolic Christian "Confession"; and the Fathers, like our author, confine their attention to this statement in offering different proof texts from scripture for its validity.

Dr. Harris arrives at a similar conclusion by comparing, the Post-Nicene Father, Gregory of Nyssa's use of Ps.45:6,7, (where the observation is made "you see that God is appointed by God. He assumed human nature and the High Priest and Apostle of our Confession",)⁴ with the Epistle. He shows that the case for their independent use of the phrase cannot be determined by a comparison of the two contexts. Their sequence of ideas is the same, which either points to the dependence of Gregory upon the Epistle or their mutual dependence/

1. Justin Martyr Dial. cxvi (ii.p.245)
2. Adv.Marc. Dial. lll.7 (iii p.256)
3. The Divine Institutes lV.14 (l.p.242)
4. See ibid.supra pp.47,48.

text from Zechariah: "He was clothed with filthy garments".

They make an attempt to get over the difficulty of the sinfulness of Joshua typified by the garments. Justin Martyr says: "We ourselves are the sinful figure here typified"¹. Tertullian² claims that it is the indignity of the incarnation. So in the Institutes of Lactantius the difficulty is met by explaining it in terms of the Incarnation: "He spoke therefore of Jesus the Son of God to show that He would first come in humility and in the flesh. For this is the filthy garment that He might prepare a Temple for God"³. As in Justin Martyr and Tertullian no mention is made of the doctrine in the Epistle or appeal to its authority. It is not sufficient reason for this neglect to say that the Epistle had a dubious authority at the time. The real reason was that the priesthood of Christ occupied a conspicuous place in an Apostolic Christian "Confession"; and the Fathers, like our author, confine their attention to this statement in offering different proof texts from scripture for its validity.

Dr. Harris arrives at a similar conclusion by comparing, the Post-Nicene Father, Gregory of Nyssa's use of Ps.45:6,7, (where the observation is made "you see that God is appointed by God. He assumed human nature and the High Priest and Apostle of our Confession",)⁴ with the Epistle. He shows that the case for their independent use of the phrase cannot be determined by a comparison of the two contexts. Their sequence of ideas is the same, which either points to the dependence of Gregory upon the Epistle or their mutual dependence/

1. Justin Martyr Dial. cxvi (ii.p.245)
2. Adv.Marc. Dial. lli.7 (iii p.256)
3. The Divine Institutes IV.14 (1.p.242)
4. See ibid.supra pp.47,48.

dependence upon a common source. There is, however, some indirect evidence in favour of the latter assumption. Dr. Harris mentions a sentence from Justin 1 Ap.63: "the one who really spoke to Moses was the Son of God who is called Angel and Apostle"; he writes:

"It is well within the bounds of possibility that 'Apostle and High-priest' may be a collocation borrowed from the heads of Testimonies as in the Cyprianic 'Angelus Deus' and similar collocation in Justin". 1

In view of our conclusions from a comparison of the doctrine of Christ's priesthood in the Ante-Nicene Fathers with that of "Hebrews" the contentions of Dr. Harris are practically established.

We conclude, therefore, that the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ existed at an early stage in the Apostolic Church and that it was later incorporated into some such body of Christian teaching as a head of Testimonies (Cyprian Treatise xii) or a "Confession" (Heb.3:1). Furthermore, it is frequently associated with the figure of Melchizedek among the Ante-Nicene Fathers - and that independently of "Hebrews". With the Post-Nicene Fathers the case is somewhat different. Mention has been made of an instance in Gregory of Nyssa where he apparently writes independently of "Hebrews". However, in another instance he directs attention to the Epistle's use of the term² "Apostle and High-Priest". And so Eusebius in speaking of the/

1. Ibid. p.48.

2. Book VI, p.184.

the doctrine quotes the Epistle, but in two other cases there is a singular absence of reference. He speaks of the *μέγας ἱερέτης* of Joshua 5:13: "as to our great High-priest; whatsoever He seeth the Father doing, those things likewise the Son doeth (Jn.5:19)".¹ Again he follows the Epistle's use of Ps.110 and 45 on the subject of priesthood,² but is silent as to their similar use in the Epistle. None of the Fathers need be unaware of, *nor are they* unaware of, the doctrine in "Hebrews", but they are all clearly sustaining a doctrine which enjoyed an independent position in Christian belief and did not originate in the Epistle.

1. Book X Ch.IV.15 p.383.

2. Book I Ch.III, p.86. It is significant that Eusebius whose writings date either shortly before the Niceaan Council, or shortly after, like the Ante-Nicene writers, makes such little use of the Epistle in speaking of this doctrine.

the doctrine quotes the Epistle, but in two other cases there is a singular absence of reference. He speaks of the *μέγας ἱερέτης* of Joshua 5:13: "as to our great High-priest; whatsoever He seeth the Father doing, those things likewise the Son doeth (Jn.5:19)".¹ Again he follows the Epistle's use of Ps.110 and 45 on the subject of priesthood,² but is silent as to their similar use in the Epistle. None of the Fathers need be unaware of, *nor are they* unaware of, the doctrine in "Hebrews", but they are all clearly sustaining a doctrine which enjoyed an independent position in Christian belief and did not originate in the Epistle.

1. Book X Ch.IV.15 p.383.

2. Book I Ch.III, p.86. It is significant that Eusebius whose writings date either shortly before the Niceaan Council, or shortly after, like the Ante-Nicene writers, makes such little use of the Epistle in speaking of this doctrine.

SOME PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN TRADITION AND THE EPISTLE.

The author's dependence upon primitive Christian tradition for many of his ideas has become a common place observation in most studies of "Hebrews" in recent years. But, besides these relationships which modern commentaries set forth, there are certain others which go a long way towards re-emphasizing the essential harmony of the Epistle's teaching with that material which was used by the Synoptic evangelists; and in his use of which our author cannot be said to have altered its original significance or given it any new development. *Before* examining this material, we shall briefly consider the data in the Epistle which point to a knowledge of the historical Jesus.

THE HISTORICAL JESUS

As we have had occasion to observe in Ch.1 of this treatise, the references to the historical Jesus in the Epistle are too clear to be denied or explained away. The hiatus, which Windisch ~~declares to exist~~ between the Jesus of the evangelists and the One depicted in our Epistle is largely unwarranted.¹ This is confirmed by the many points of contact which the Epistle has with the Synoptic accounts of the historical Jesus. In "Hebrews" the eschatological foundation of ^{author's} ~~the~~ view of the world and redemption is a tie which connects ~~it~~ ^{eschatology} closely with the Synoptic prophecy of the Baptist and/

1. See Windisch *ibid.* supra pp.25-27 and 130,131.

and of Jesus. For the Jesus of "Hebrews" preached "salvation" (2:3), the message of eschatological bliss. The author follows the general view of the evangelists that Jesus belonged to the tribe of Judah (7:14). The strong emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus is redolent of the One "Who came eating and drinking", "Who came not to be ministered unto but to minister". Again, "He was in all points tempted..." (4:15, 2:18), recalls the story of the Temptations of Jesus (Matt.4:1-11, Lk.4:1-13). The author's view that the sufferings of Jesus are not incompatible with his sinlessness and that they rendered his sacrifice altogether efficacious, accords well with the primitive Synoptic traditions. The writer shows a close knowledge of the Passion story (5:7,8)¹. It is these verses which Dr. Moffatt regards as giving the clearest indication that the Jesus of the Epistle cannot be a mere deduction from Messianic Christology or prophecies of the Old Testament. He writes:

"It is unreal to imagine that in view of 5:7 the author is doing little more than painting a human face among the messianic speculations about a divine Son".²

The impassioned prayer of 5:7 clearly remirrors the Synoptists' /

1. Windisch writes: "Sein Wehklagen in Todesangst 5:7 war aus Ps.21 zu entnehmen; dass er auf sein Leiden hin erhöht und zum Sohn und Hohenpriester proclamiert worden sei 2:9 f. 5:5-10, ergab eine Kombination der Messiahischen Psalmen," p.26. This is probable but far from convincing. In the first place Ps.21 could not be more remote from the thought of the verses in question, and if an Old Testament passage is in mind, it is more likely to be Prov.3:11,12.
2. I.C.C."Hebrews", p.65.

Synoptists' impressive accounts of the Gethsemane scene. The Epistle lays great stress upon the moral obedience of Christ, which is not only in line with the Synoptic view of Jesus but with all New Testament literature. It may be said that our Epistle lays even greater stress on this aspect of our Lord's life than do the Synoptic accounts in general. It is the absolute obedience of the Gethsemane prayer that is reflected in Heb.10;7, "Lo I am come, in the volume of the Book it is written of Me to do Thy will O God". Hoskyns says of the historic Jesus' obedience:

"It was a conscious obedience to that demanded by the Old Testament scriptures. A consciousness that the whole weight of the Law and the prophets had come to rest on Him. Not the Church but Jesus is responsible for putting this interpretation on His life". 1

The Motif of the "opposition of sinners", is gathered both from the story of the Passion and the many other conflicts in the life of Jesus. It recalls in particular the Synoptic accounts of the Trial. Then there is not only the mention of the Cross, but the singularly graphic detail that it was outside the gate (13:12). This detail seems to be presumed in all the accounts of the crucifixion, but in none is it definitely stated that Jesus died outside the city. John 19:20, "the Cross was nigh to the city", implies the addition which is made in the Epistle. Goguel writes of this detail in Hebrews:

"Because the writer of the Epistle brings this detail into relief owing to the allegorical significance which he accords it, there is no legitimate reason to suppose that he postulates it/

1. Hoskyns "The Riddle of the New Testament", p.252.

it for ulterior convenience. In a speculative construction this detail would not be thus isolated; it would form a part of a general picture interpreted as allegory. In the position in which it is found, it is only to be explained by supposing that it is borrowed from a narrative of the death of Jesus, from which it is detached because of its allegorical significance". 1

In all this we have not a complete life of Jesus, but the total impression is not of a divine Being enacting a drama of redemption with no basis in fact other than the fancy of the writer playing upon Old Testament tales of suffering and prophecies of a redeemer. Though the pre-existence of Christ is touched upon at the beginning it is not emphasized or taken up into the writer's thought of the person of the Son. In fact, it is almost forgotten and the author's attention is directed on the one hand from Jesus on earth to Jesus as He is in His Heavenly role. Thus the sufferings are not thought of as belonging to One who dipped into humanity for a time. Though in the opening chapter there is an ~~approach~~ ^{approach} to an incarnate Wisdom doctrine (1:2,3), the dominant doctrine is adoptionist (1:5).

The picture which we get of Jesus here is in some respects more human than that found in the Synoptics. The story of the Temptations bears this out; in the evangelists the Temptations are to a divine Being, whereas in "Hebrews" the Temptations arise from the human nature of Jesus. Again, not even in the Synoptics, do you find the developmental view of Jesus' character as in Hebrews, (2:9,10). This/

1. Maurice Goguel: "Jesus the Nazarene" 1926 p.145. In Dahman "Jesus-Jeshua", a remark is made much to the same effect. p.189.

This may reflect Stoical influence, but the interest which the author takes in the human Jesus seems to come rather from a genuine interest in, and knowledge of, the Galilean who "loved righteousness and hated iniquity", (1:9), who was faithful like Moses (3:5,6), sympathetic (5:5), whose life was guided by the same quality of human faith which had inspired others in the past (11:1). This Jesus was holy, guileless, undefiled and finally made higher than the Heavens (7:26). So that the Jesus of "Hebrews" is the same One met with in the Synoptic accounts; if not dependent upon these sources entirely, the author is at least reliant upon parallel traditions.

Parallels with General Synoptic Teaching.

At a number of points there is a remarkable parallelism with Synoptic teaching in general. Noticeable among which is the Epistle's mention of the Kingdom of God which is to come (12:28); the thought is probably an echo of Jesus saying "Fear not it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom". More than once our author reminds his readers of the future judgment.¹ As in the Synoptics, repentance (6:1) is counted among the fundamentals of Christian teaching.

Again the Epistle's conception of God has more points in common with the Synoptics than with either Paul or John. His conception of God is that of the awesome God of Sinai (12:18-29). The Fatherhood of God is not taught in "Hebrews" but like the Synoptists the author teaches/

1. Heb.9:27; 6:8; 10:25.

teaches the separateness of God and man. There is no idea in either writings of the mystical indwelling of God, found in Paul and John. Basically the conception of God found¹ in the Synoptics and "Hebrews" is that of prophetic Judaism.

Underlying Synoptic Material and the Epistle.

1. In Heb.10;20 the writer takes the tradition which the Synoptists have recorded about the rending of the veil, and allegorizes it to mean the flesh of Christ. Prof.Manson suggests that this tradition, as used by the evangelists, may have been symbolic in origin and he equates the symbolic origin with Hebrews 10:19-20, "through the dying of the Son² of Man the veil between God and man is removed". In view of this one is led to inquire whether underneath the Gospel accounts there are not to be found further resemblances with the atmosphere and ideas of the Epistle, and further similarities of symbolism.

It is extremely doubtful if those resemblances which are said to exist between the Epistle and certain of the Gospels, can be said to be real. For it seems evident that any apparent resemblance must be referred back to the Synoptic sources. There are, for example, certain features of doctrine in Mark, indicating a common point of view with "Hebrews". B.W.Bacon has pointed out certain of these and affirmed that in "Hebrews" we have a writing which is almost contemporary/

1. E.F.Scott: "The Kingdom of God" writes: "Jesus remained faithful to that belief in the separateness of God and man which He had inherited from Hebrew religion", p.21.
2. "The Gospel of Luke", pp.261,262. (Moffatt New Testament Commentary).

Chapter V

contemporary with Mark. He indicates a common reaction against a Son of David Christology; their conception of Judaism as marked by Sabbath-keeping; their protest against restricting worship to a Temple made with hands; their¹ disparagement of the outward forms of worship. But it is doubtful if the introduction of these issues by both writers can be seriously regarded as indicating a common atmosphere; they probably belong to the sources of Mark rather than to Mark itself; for there are like resemblances² in Lukan writings. Moreover there are definite similarities with the Matthaean atmosphere.

In both Matthew and "Hebrews" there is the same extensive use of the Old Testament scriptures; this is to a greater extent than in other New Testament writings. They both introduce into their discourse blocks of scripture from the Septuagint and Testimonia. Often this material³ bears the stamp of anti-Judaism. Here, we call attention to only one of those Matthaean passages which has preserved a genuinely primitive Christian attitude which becomes the main theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Mat.26:65 the evangelist records the high priest's gesture of rending his clothes on hearing the reply of Jesus to the question of His Messiahship. Popular exegesis, of this verse and the/

1. "Gospel of Mark", p.67.

2. Cf. Heb.9:11,24. Acts 7:48; Lk.11:41. Cf. particularly the Benedictus, the correspondence in language (Lk.1,70, Heb.1:1,2); the Saviour rises from House of David (Lk.1:69, Heb.6:14); the covenant confirmed with an oath (Lk.1:72,73. Heb.6:13).

3. See McNeille: "Gospel according to St. Matthew", p.Xvlll. also Box "The Value of O.T. in Rel. to N.T." in "The People and the Book" pp.439 ff.

contemporary with Mark. He indicates a common reaction against a Son of David Christology; their conception of Judaism as marked by Sabbath-keeping; their protest against restricting worship to a Temple made with hands; their¹ disparagement of the outward forms of worship. But it is doubtful if the introduction of these issues by both writers can be seriously regarded as indicating a common atmosphere; they probably belong to the sources of Mark rather than to Mark itself; for there are like resemblances² in Lukan writings. Moreover there are definite similarities with the Matthaean atmosphere.

In both Matthew and "Hebrews" there is the same extensive use of the Old Testament scriptures; this is to a greater extent than in other New Testament writings. They both introduce into their discourse blocks of scripture from the Septuagint and Testimonia. Often this material³ bears the stamp of anti-Judaism. Here, we call attention to only one of those Matthaean passages which has preserved a genuinely primitive Christian attitude which becomes the main theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In Mat.26:65 the evangelist records the high priest's gesture of rending his clothes on hearing the reply of Jesus to the question of His Messiahship. Popular exegesis, of this verse and the/

1. "Gospel of Mark", p.67.
2. Cf. Heb.9:11,24. Acts 7:48; Lk.11:41. Cf. particularly the Benedictus, the correspondence in language (Lk.1,70, Heb.1:1,2); the Saviour rises from House of David (Lk.1:69, Heb.6:14); the covenant confirmed with an oath (Lk.1:72,73. Heb.6:13).
3. See McNeile: "Gospel according to St. Matthew", p.Xviii. also Box "The Value of O.T. in Rel. to N.T." in "The People and the Book" pp.439 ff.

the Synoptic parallels, has regarded this act as signifying that the priesthood should be rent away from him and his nation. This interpretation is certainly valid in so far as the text of Matthew is concerned. The Levitical Law expressly forbid one, who occupied so august an office, to demean it by such an unregulated display of vexation: "He who is high priest among his brethren, upon whose head the holy oil was poured, and who is consecrated to put on the garments, shall not uncover his head or rend his garments",¹ (Lev.21:10). A comparison of Lev.21:10 with Mat.26:65, indicates that the evangelist has carefully preserved the very words of the Septuagint:² *τότε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς σιμῶνεν τὰ ἱμάτια; καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς . . . καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια οὐ σιμῶνεν*. Matthew clearly is not merely preserving the Markan material and adding the blasphemy exclamation. For Mark has *ἀρχιερεὺς σιμῶνας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ* (14:63). Consequently Matthew has either altered the Markan text into conformity with that of the Septuagint with a symbolic motive or the symbolic intention was already contained in a conventional Christian usage of the Leviticus passage, which the author of the first Gospel consciously embodied in his narrative. In any case it points to an early Christian dogma that the true priesthood no longer belonged to Judaism. It is just such an example of early Anti-Judaic symbolism/

1. McNeile suggests that at the time of our Lord, there may have grown up a custom that required such an act on the hearing of a blasphemy. But there is no record of such being the case. See his Commentary on Matthew, pp.402,403.
2. See "Leading Ideas of the Gospel" by Wm.Alexander, p.234 f. He points to the symbolical intention of Matthew in this verse, noting the LXX correspondence. It is doubtful though whether Matthew made the extensive use of type and symbol which this writer claims.

the Synoptic parallels, has regarded this act as signifying that the priesthood should be rent away from him and his nation. This interpretation is certainly valid in so far as the text of Matthew is concerned. The Levitical Law expressly forbade one, who occupied so august an office, to demean it by such an unregulated display of vexation: "He who is high priest among his brethren, upon whose head the holy oil was poured, and who is consecrated to put on the garments, shall not uncover his head or rend his garments",¹ (Lev.21:10). A comparison of Lev.21:10 with Mat.26:65, indicates that the evangelist has carefully preserved the very words of the Septuagint:² *τότε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς σιρρήσεν τὰ ἱμάτια; καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς . . . καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια οὐ σιρρήσεν*. Matthew clearly is not merely preserving the Markan material and adding the blasphemy exclamation. For Mark has *ἀρχιερεὺς σιρρήσας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ* (14:63). Consequently Matthew has either altered the Markan text into conformity with that of the Septuagint with a symbolic motive or the symbolic intention was already contained in a conventional Christian usage of the Leviticus passage, which the author of the first Gospel consciously embodied in his narrative. In any case it points to an early Christian dogma that the true priesthood no longer belonged to Judaism. It is just such an example of early Anti-Judaic symbolism/

1. McNeile suggests that at the time of our Lord, there may have grown up a custom that required such an act on the hearing of a blasphemy. But there is no record of such being the case. See his Commentary on Matthew, pp.402,403.
2. See "Leading Ideas of the Gospel" by Wm.Alexander, p.234 f. He points to the symbolical intention of Matthew in this verse, noting the LXX correspondence. It is doubtful though whether Matthew made the extensive use of type and symbol which this writer claims.

symbolism/^{which}will account for the express mention in Cyprian's "Testimonies against the Jews", noted above, where the old high priest gives place to the true High priest, Jesus Christ. Neither in "Hebrews" nor the Church Fathers is there direct reference to this symbolism recorded by the first evangelist. But it may have been a point which provoked frequent discussion before non-Pauline Christian congregations. The author of "Hebrews" in his main argument re-emphasizes this primitive Christian teaching, in which the Passion of our Lord was depicted as that of the true Messiah and true High Priest confronting the degradation of an apostate priesthood.

The Transfiguration Narratives.

2. Another example of the relationship with, or dependence upon, the traditions used by the evangelists, is the correspondence between the Transfiguration Midrash and the central doctrine of our Epistle, the Priesthood of Christ. The Transfiguration account is sometimes classed among the early Midrashic materials of the primitive Christian tradition. The adoption of the term "Midrash" does not necessarily preclude the possibility of the story having some basis in historical fact. We use the term here because it most aptly suggests the essential character of the Transfiguration narratives, based as they are upon an Old Testament sub-structure of texts. But the narrator appears to have reflected both upon scriptural texts and some reminiscences of an actual event. We maintain that this theory/

theory of the Transfiguration incident accounts for more of the details of the story than does the theory of mystic vision. The latter savours too much of being an arbitrary attempt to apply modern psychic theories, for rationalization purposes, to a story which appears to have been told with a dogmatic intention other than those for which the Synoptists use it. Though the atmosphere of the story naturally lends itself to such characterization, there is too much studied symbolism for the whole narrative to be explained in terms of visionary experience.

Again the mystic vision explanation is lacking in plausibility when the scriptural sub-structure is taken into account. At once its Midrashic nature is revealed. (B.W. Bacon has stated that the whole Fourth Gospel is a substitute for it). In his treatment of the account he has failed to see that it is based upon more than Ex.24:⁹⁻¹⁸, and that it serves more purpose than to teach "that the followers of the Son of Man become sharers of the Heavenly Paradise, where dwell already in glorified bodies, the men Moses and Elias"¹. Exactly what the narrative form was before the Synoptic evangelists made use of it is difficult to determine; but that it served a different purpose than that for which it is employed by them is evident. The divergent manner in which they super-impose the Resurrection and Passion dogma,² points to an earlier form in which these are absent (cf./

1. See Pfliederer: "Primitive Christianity", vol.11, p.508.
2. See Bacon: "Gospel of Mark", p.253.

(cf. Mk.9:4,10; Lk.9:31,36). We conclude that it is an early fragment of Christian Midrash which the evangelists arbitrarily used to project into the past the fact of the Passion and Resurrection. The original narrative dealt with the fulfilment in Christ of conventional Messianic prophecies.

Besides the sub-structure of Ex.24:9-18, is also Zechariah chapters 2 and 3. Jesus had, on some such occasion as the evangelists record, associated His Messianic role with that of Moses and Elias; and in His mind was also Zechariah's account of the High-priest Joshua who was transfigured and brought in the Messianic Kingdom (ch.3). The accounts then may owe much of their present scriptural content to Jesus Himself, and even the original Midrashic form. Or at any rate, it must represent later reflection upon an historical event in which Jesus had represented Himself as the greater Moses who inaugurated the New Covenant before which even the authorities of the Old Covenant must give way; He also thought of Himself as the new Joshua who was to bring in the Messianic Kingdom.

That Zechariah, chapters 2 and 3, forms part of the scriptural sub-structure is, we believe, confirmed by the correspondence which Selwyn has shown to exist between the Transfiguration narrative and Zechariah.¹ He quotes J. Lightfoot on Mat.17:2; "In this Transfiguration He is sealed for/

1. "New Testament Oracles", p.265 ff.

(cf. Mk.9:4,10; Lk.9:31,36). We conclude that it is an early fragment of Christian Midrash which the evangelists arbitrarily used to project into the past the fact of the Passion and Resurrection. The original narrative dealt with the fulfilment in Christ of conventional Messianic prophecies.

Besides the sub-structure of Ex.24:9-18, is also Zechariah chapters 2 and 3. Jesus had, on some such occasion as the evangelists record, associated His Messianic role with that of Moses and Elias; and in His mind was also Zechariah's account of the High-priest Joshua who was transfigured and brought in the Messianic Kingdom (ch.3). The accounts then may owe much of their present scriptural content to Jesus Himself, and even the original Midrashic form. Or at any rate, it must represent later reflection upon an historical event in which Jesus had represented Himself as the greater Moses who inaugurated the New Covenant before which even the authorities of the Old Covenant must give way; He also thought of Himself as the new Joshua who was to bring in the Messianic Kingdom.

That Zechariah, chapters 2 and 3, forms part of the scriptural sub-structure is, we believe, confirmed by the correspondence which Selwyn has shown to exist between the Transfiguration narrative and Zechariah.¹ He quotes J. Lightfoot on Mat.17:2; "In this Transfiguration He is sealed for/

1. "New Testament Oracles", p.265 ff.

for High-priesthood. When Jesus was baptized He is sealed by a Heavenly voice for the High-priesthood and is anointed by the Holy Spirit as the High Priest was wont to be with the holy oil". Selwyn continues that if Lightfoot had known the connection between Zechariah 2 and 3, and the Transfiguration, he would not have failed to have shown Jesus, the High Priest. He points out that the Transfiguration takes place on a high mountain (cf. Zech. 2:5, 3:1). Jesus came near and "touched them" (Zech. 2:8). The encounter with Satan follows upon the descent from the mountain; "after the glory" (Zech. 2:8). is singularly paralleled in the Gospels, for the rebuke of the devil (Zech. 3:2), in all of the Gospel accounts, is regarded as part of the Transfiguration (Mt. 17:18; Lk. 9:42; Mk. 9:25). Luke writes: "They were all astonished at the majesty of God" (9:43). Upon which Selwyn remarks: "This is accounted for by the fact that Zech. 3 is in some way or other behind the Gospel. The majesty is that of Jesus, the Great Priest, who is transfigured as to His raiment in this chapter also, after His triumph over the devil".

These parallels do suggest that the Transfiguration account contains hints of a discussion between Jesus and His disciples, of this very passage in Zechariah, which has definite reference to the priesthood of the Messiah.² It cannot be demonstrated that the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ found in "Hebrews" is dependent upon this underlying/

1. Ibid. p. 286.

2. See the discussion of the Messianic references of 1 Zechariah in ch. vii of this treatise.

underlying Transfiguration material for he uses Psl.110 and Gen.14 rather than Zechariah. But there is some evidence of his having in mind certain of the ideas and phrases peculiar to Zechariah. It may be that it is some extracts from the Book which were in circulation, possibly in a Book of Testimonies, that he is familiar with. This seems to be the most likely conclusion, for it is these same passages dealing with the priesthood of Christ which we find in use among the Church Fathers. It is not suggested that our author is making use of an earlier form of Transfiguration narrative, but the facts seem to point to a common use within an early Church circle of these very passages of Zechariah which are reflected in the Transfiguration accounts and ~~which~~^{possibly} form the basis of some of the passages in Hebrews. His use of Zechariah is meagre; however, Selwyn points to certain parallels. Zech.3:8 "Hear now Jesus the great Priest" though not exactly the Greek of Heb.4:14 seems the basis of the Epistle's designation of Christ, ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας, but, is not explicitly used until Heb.10:21, καὶ ἱερεὺς μέγας. Again definitely in Heb.13:20 the Greek of Zech.9:11 is used. Two other quotations are less definitely used, Heb.7:14, ἀνατέτακται, hath arisen, may imply that He is not merely born of that tribe, but that His birth has been the rising of a new dawn of day ('anatole'). It may be inferred that Hebrews has used the Greek also of Zech.6:13 in Ch.7:26/

1. With the exception of two passages most commentators see no further reference in the Epistle to Zechariah, (cf. Heb.13:20; Zech.9:11. Heb.10:21; Zech.6:11f).

Ch.7:26 "made higher than the Heavens" represents "He shall¹ sit and take precedence upon His throne".

But entirely apart from any dependence of our Epistle on Zechariah the fact remains that "Hebrews" echoes the primitive contrast of Moses and Jesus, of which it appears much was made² in the early Church. That the Messiah should combine the functions of the Supreme Prophet and final Deliverer was a commonplace of Jewish expectation. The Christians described themselves as "the Way", the following of the prophet like unto Moses.² Again it is claimed by Bacon that much was made in the teaching of the synagogue of the mediation of Moses, the offering of his life for the forgiveness of the people; Exodus 32:31 "ye have sinned a great sin; and now I shall go up to Jehovah; peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin".³ Thus the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ is implied not only in the use of the symbolism of Moses on the Mount but also in the underlying Zechariah material. The Epistle to the Hebrews, whether dependent on Zechariah or not, has a doctrine of Christ's priesthood in common with the Transfiguration account. It, too, has the conception of the New Covenant corresponding to that we have observed to have been symbolised in this narrative of a transfigured, second⁴ Moses./

1. The basis of this comparison is that of Selwyn "New Testament Oracles", pp.126,127.
2. See Burton S.Easton: "Christ in the Gospels", ch.2.
3. B.W.Bacon "Mark" p.239.
4. Bacon ibid. writes: "In 2 Cor.3:6, 6:6 Paul compares the ministry of the New Covenant to the ministration of Moses in obtaining forgiveness and bringing down the Torah from Heaven", p.237.

Ch.7:26 "made higher than the Heavens" represents "He shall¹ sit and take precedence upon His throne".

But entirely apart from any dependence of our Epistle on Zechariah the fact remains that "Hebrews" echoes the primitive contrast of Moses and Jesus, of which it appears much was made² in the early Church. That the Messiah should combine the functions of the Supreme Prophet and final Deliverer was a commonplace of Jewish expectation. The Christians described themselves as "the Way", the following of the prophet like unto Moses.² Again it is claimed by Bacon that much was made in the teaching of the synagogue of the mediation of Moses, the offering of his life for the forgiveness of the people; Exodus 32:31 "ye have sinned a great sin; and now I shall go up to Jehovah; peradventure I shall make atonement for your sin".³ Thus the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ is implied not only in the use of the symbolism of Moses on the Mount but also in the underlying Zechariah material. The Epistle to the Hebrews, whether dependent on Zechariah or not, has a doctrine of Christ's priesthood in common with the Transfiguration account. It, too, has the conception of the New Covenant corresponding to that we have observed to have been symbolised in this narrative of a transfigured, second⁴ Moses./

1. The basis of this comparison is that of Selwyn "New Testament Oracles", pp.126,127.
2. See Burton S.Easton: "Christ in the Gospels", ch.2.
3. B.W.Bacon "Mark" p.239.
4. Bacon ibid. writes: "In 2 Cor.3:6, 6:6 Paul compares the ministry of the New Covenant to the ministration of Moses in obtaining forgiveness and bringing down the Torah from Heaven", p.237.

Moses./ Our conclusion is again that our author is not so far removed from authentic primitive tradition as viewed from the standpoint of the Synoptic narratives.

The Sabbath Rest.

3. For the reality of our contention that the author of "Hebrews" is merely embodying in his writing primitive Christian material, which is similar to or parallel with that used by the Synoptists, nothing is more significant than his peculiar use of "the Sabbath Rest of God" (chs.3,4). Jewish scholars have frequently questioned the Synoptic accounts of the Pharisaic demand for Jesus' destruction because of His action on the Sabbath Day. Acts of mercy¹ and healing were not forbidden, they claim. Sir Edwyn Hoskyns has presented a very plausible solution for at least a part of these recorded Sabbath controversies; and which at the same time links the Epistle's use of "Sabbath Rest" to² an early Christian traditional usage.

Commenting on the Jewish objection, he asserts that the solution of the problem lies in the meaning which was inclosed in this word "Sabbath". He claims that the protest of Jesus was not against the rigour of Sabbath observance, nor did He diverge from Pharisaic opinion by emphasizing the supremacy of human generosity over that of ecclesiastical regulation. Hoskyns points out how the Septuagint translators reproduced the Hebrew root שבת and its synonyms by 'anapausis', 'anapauein' and other parts, which denoted, not primarily/

1. See "The Jewish Encyclopedia", article "The Sabbath Rest", vol.X p.597.
2. "Mysterium Christi" article by E.Hoskyns "Jesus the Messiah", pp. 69-89.

primarily human rest and peace, but the expected descent of the peace and mercy of God with its consequent freedom from labour and trouble in this world. He is of the opinion that such a translation of *Shabbat* had the effect of linking the word Sabbath to those prophetic passages which looked forward to the advent of the peace of God: Is.14:33; Ez.34:15,16. And he contends that this must have been the significance Jesus attached to "Sabbath" in order to have provoked the Pharisees.

He deems that this theory, of attributing to Jesus a definite Messianic interpretation of the Jewish Sabbath, can be applied to the Gospel Sabbath passages generally. However, from a study of these passages one hesitates to make such a sweeping application of the theory. For many of them bear the unmistakable stamp of actual offence having been taken at Jesus' transgression of the conventional Sabbath Day observances. Linked up with these same, are distinct elements which permit of none other than the Messianic interpretation. Such passages as Mk.2:23-28; Lk.6:5 and Mt.12:5-9; Lk.3:1-6, in which Jesus is spoken of as "Lord of the Sabbath" readily fit this Messianic interpretation. But it is another thing to say that all the Sabbath references can be dealt with under this head. Granting the validity of Hoskyns' theory in accounting for the Pharisees destructive intentions; at the same time it is felt that we are on safer historical ground when we allow with the Synoptics for the actual occurrence of controversy over Sabbath day observance. These certainly would have provoked/

provoked rebuke from the custodians of ceremonial conventions; only the claims to be the Messiah of God who would bring in the era of Peace and Rest could have impelled them to seek to take His life.

It seems quite impossible to classify the evangelists' accounts of the Sabbath incidents and to distinguish precisely the "Sabbath Day acts" from the "Sabbath Rest" Messianic claims. The evangelists certainly appear to be oblivious of any such distinction. But there is some evidence that there was a distinction existing in the written or oral tradition which they used. This they overlooked or neglected, interpreting all as offences against the Sabbath Day observance. In John 5:18 is to be found a singular example of the combining of the two separate traditional forms. Here the evangelist explicitly states that the dissatisfaction of the Jews was not due to the breaking of the Sabbath day, but the unique claim which Jesus made for Himself: "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God". We believe that the principle which can be applied to this passage can, though less accurately, be applied to the Synoptic accounts where no discrimination is made in what incited rebuke and what incited the bitterest Pharasaic malevolence. Both connotations of the term "Sabbath" go back to certain acts and sayings of Jesus. The one had to do with actions on the Sabbath Day which aroused zealous Sabbatarians; the other was connected with definite sayings and claims of our Lord about/

about the "Sabbath Rest of God".

It is obvious that if we have not here the source of the idea of the "Sabbath Rest of God" in our Epistle, we have at least what is parallel with the teaching of Jesus underlying the Gospel accounts of the "Sabbath". In Heb.3:2-4:11, the author uses Ps.95:7-11 to point out the failure of Israel to obtain the promised Rest of God. His argument shows how that Jesus Christ is the great Messianic High-Priest to whom Moses bore witness, and that Christians are the members of the new household of God. He continues with a description of how the Messianic Order is the fulfilment of the ancient Sabbath hope. Through unbelief the Jews had failed to enter into that Rest. The ancient Jesus had not given that Rest to the people of God, but we, through faith in our great High-Priest, may enter into the true Sabbath salvation. It may be contended that the similarity may not be due to dependence upon the primitive Christian tradition and that he has arrived at these views entirely from a study of LXX Messianic prophecy, and is oblivious of a parallel Christian tradition being in existence, since he appeals neither to the authority of Christian tradition nor refers to Jesus' teaching on the matter:¹ To which it seems unnecessary to say more than that one who is simply repeating primitive Christian tradition, that in itself constituted for him his authority./

1. Though Windisch does not touch on the problem in question, he would certainly be compelled, in virtue of his view that the author's source of ideas is not the Christian tradition but Alexandrian exegesis of Old Testament Messianic prophecies, to see the source of the Sabbath conception there also.

authority. And the writer constantly makes his appeal to that authority of his tradition: "consider the Apostle and High Priest of our 'Confession'", "seeing then that we have a great high priest".

The New Covenant.

The whole question of the Epistle's use of *diatheke* and its relation to Old Testament and New Testament use, has involved an endless amount of learned discussion. From our study of the question it does not appear necessary^{either} to confine the use of the term translated "Covenant" in Hebrews and other New Testament books to that of a legal agreement between two parties, or to consider the idea of "contract" being the connotation of the LXX translation. Upon sufficient grounds scholars have affirmed that the ancient "ברית" came to be regarded as something God alone instituted.¹ The idea of a legal contract or "will" is no doubt blended with the idea of the "Covenant" God makes with His people in Heb. 9:15-18 and in Gal. 3:15, but underneath this play upon words is the ancient conception of Ex. 20:9-18 and Jer. 31:31f where it is God, not man, who institutes the new spiritual order.

The ancient Covenant involved the necessity of a death (Gen. 22:9-18), which custom was still in existence in the time of Jeremiah (34:18f). It was a Covenant ratified by shedding of blood, and it was God who provided the victim (cf. Heb. 7:22). The idea survives in Maccabaeae times, (1 Mac./

1. Scott: "Epistle to The Hebrews", p.90. See also H.A.A. Kennedy: "Theology of the Epistles", p.198 "The covenant was one of Grace."

(1 Mac.2:54 cf. Num.25:7-13; 4 Mac.6:27-29, 17:22). In all these cases the establishment of a covenant involved the removal of the sin of the people by a death. The author of "Hebrews" recognized that such was the nature of the Old Covenant; and when he speaks of the New Covenant promised in Jeremiah (31:31-34)¹, all its inwardness and its basis in the forgiveness of sins, he contends, was fulfilled in Christ's offering of Himself, (10:16-18).

The writer of "Hebrews" insists that the New Covenant was inaugurated by Christ in His death, and has replaced the Old Covenant. This, he conceives, entailed the abolishment of the entire sacrificial system which the Old Covenant had introduced.² All the ritual sacrifices and ceremonies, pertaining thereto, merely foreshadowed the one true priestly action and sacrifice.³ The legitimacy of his disposing, in this manner, of the whole old order of things has been questioned. In the first place on the grounds of the proof he offers from the Old Testament; and in the second place, on the grounds of its want of authority in the teaching of Jesus. The validity of these two interrogations of the author's use of the idea of a New Covenant rests upon the assumption that his whole argument is made in defence of an arbitrary premise. But does the text of the Epistle justify our thinking that he is attempting any such thing? By what right can we say that/

1. Cf. Heb.8:8-10.

2. Cf. Heb.9:8-22, Ex.24:6-8.

3. Heb. 10:1-10.

that he is engaged in authorizing and justifying his own personal conviction or theory that the Old Covenant is now obsolete? Indeed in so far as the text of the Epistle is concerned, he is, as we saw in Ch.111 of this treatise, not arguing to justify any doctrinal position of his own in this case either, but rather maintaining an accepted teaching of the Church. Remembering the practical purpose which scholarship has affirmed the Epistle serves, let us examine the author's argument.

(1) The whole institution of sacrifice was arranged by God Himself as an imperfect imitation of the Heavenly service of sacrifice (cf. Ex.25:40, Heb.8:5). From the very beginning the insufficiency of the old order and the necessity of its future suppression was imprinted upon it (Heb.9:8). He supports this position by quoting from Ps.39:7-9, where it is stated that the Law was not an expression of God's will, but that Christ's coming and His sacrifice had divulged the Divine will (Heb.10:5-10). He continues, that the abolishment of animal sacrifice was made clear in the Old Testament (cf. Heb.13:15; Ps.49:14-15).

(2) Then the priesthood, which was bound up with an imperfect system, was only a temporary one. He maintains that there was a priesthood before that of Moses and Levi, and to which Christ was divinely appointed. Such is his theme on the basis of Ps.110:4. The readers are in doubt about the legitimacy of the Christian claim. He reassures them that the Christian position is tenable on the grounds that Scripture had proclaimed the inefficiency of the Levitic/

Levitic institution of sacrifice and its future abolishment (Heb.7).

Were our author deducing from Scripture an arbitrary doctrine of his own, for the non-validity of the order of things under the Old Covenant, he would at once have seen, master as he certainly was of the Old Testament scriptures, that Scripture not only contradicted itself upon this point, but also contradicted his own position. For the Law explicitly taught that the sacrifice on Atonement day really atoned for sin and purified the conscience (Lev.9: 1 7). We question whether the author could have completely ignored the contradictory element in scripture, if his teaching was nothing more than a theory, the authority and validity of which was a deduction from the same scripture. His discriminating choice of scriptural proof texts - which may after all not be so much a choice as the use of common anti-Judaic texts - can be understood only providing his teaching has already had a recognized place in practical Christian teaching of the primitive Church. In such a case he would be justified in selecting just such proof texts, or making use of current usage of the same, to substantiate the doctrine. Consequently, we take it that his initial authority for this teaching re. the abolishment of the sacrificial ritual and priesthood obtaining under the Old Covenant, comes not by way of deduction from scripture/

1. See Windisch *ibid.* supra p.91, Speaking of this contradictory element in Scripture, he infers that the author accidentally overlooked it: "ist vom Verfasser vermutlich übersehen worden".

scripture or from any fanciful opinion of the author, but from a known early Christian teaching.

The author of "Hebrews" does not explicitly state that the New Covenant was part of the teaching of the "Confession" known to his readers, but this creed apparently contained all the essential doctrines of the faith to which he exhorts them to hold fast (4:14). So that with a reasonable degree of certitude we can assume it to have mentioned the New Covenant in much the same manner as it was mentioned in one of the Heads of Cyprian's Testimonies.¹

It is difficult to understand the author's omission of any reference to the Christian Eucharist in any of its historical forms. It almost appears deliberate. (Prof. Nairne suggests that the Epistle was written to correct certain Eucharistic abuses). The Eucharist certainly has a place in his thought even though no allusion is made to it. When he speaks of the death of Christ as supplanting the old sacrificial order and fulfilling the function which it was incapable of effecting for sinful man, only some form of the institution of the Last Supper can have been in his mind, and that, the institution which our Lord had Himself instituted with His attention fixed upon His certain death.² Hoskyns writes:

"If it be correct critical procedure and the only adequate procedure to read the logia of Jesus (This is my body...) with ears ringing with the Old Testament as a whole, it is exceedingly difficult not to find in these final words a conscious superseding and fulfilment of the Old Testament sacrificial system".

What/

1. See preceeding chapter p.72.
2. "Mysterium Christi", chapter entitled "Jesus the Messiah", p.87.

What more then is our author doing than merely justifying from scripture a definite Christian teaching which was in the first place occasioned by our Lord's words?

Appeal here to the institution of the Lord's Supper, beset as it is with the problems of its original nature and object, may appear inapt.¹ Nevertheless there can be little doubt that on one point we can be fairly certain: in all four accounts, our Lord is represented as declaring that the significance of the action lay in its marking the establishment of a New Covenant - that spoken of by Jeremiah.² The primary source of our author's argument was the words of Jesus. He does not call attention to them as his authority by reason of the fact that his whole Epistle may be said to be a justification of Jesus' claim. The claim which Jesus made on that last night with the disciples is summed up by Dalman in the followings words:³

"It is clear that Jesus' blood of agreement would not have been necessary, if the bereit of God with the fathers, well known to all Israelites, had still been in force, to such an extent as to convey to them all the blessings contained in it, and if the former blood of the bereit had fulfilled its purpose permanently. In that case God's agreement for which he was now laying the foundation, would transcend the former even as to its content..... What He said at the distribution of the bread and wine was indeed bold, in fact did away with the whole Old Testament dispensation and put something new in its place".

1. For literature dealing with the historical origin of the Eucharist the reader is referred to Brillioth: "Eucharistic Faith and Practice", chapter 1. "The New Testament Basis"; W.O.E.Oesterley: "The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy".
2. Jer.31:33. See article "The Feast of the New Covenant" by Canon D.McLaren (C.Q.R. cvx p.10 Oct.1932).
3. "Jesus-Jeshua", p.169.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE MESSIAH

Of this doctrine of the priesthood of the Messiah

¹
Stanton wrote:

"The priesthood of the Messiah was pre-eminently a Christian conception. Indeed it does not seem ever to have been admitted in Jewish teaching".

Though this view has undergone considerable alteration in recent years ^{as the result of} the prominence which the doctrine had in certain of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal writings, the opinion of the majority of English and German scholars is that it is late and belonging almost entirely to the period of the Maccabaeans. The obstacles, to acceptance of this conclusion, are by no means removed by a placing of the 110th Psalm in Maccabaeian times - however warrantable ² such dating of the Psalm may be. For two German scholars, at least, find indisputable evidence of the prominence of the belief both in pre-exilic and post-exilic Jewish literature. In fact, Gressmann affirms that priesthood belongs to the very ³ earliest notion of Messiah.

The Israelites borrowed their notion of a Messiah from the Amorites who are not to be thought of as the originators ⁴ so much as the transmitters. It was the court custom, in the Near East in primitive times, to anoint the king. The significance of which Gressmann writes was that the King was both political leader and the high priest who had the ordering of/

1. "Jewish and Christian Messiah", pp.128,129.

2. Ed.Konig and H.Gressmann.

3. See "Der Messias", p.231. He thinks the belief originated in Egypt.

4. Ibid.supra, p.23

of the sacrifices. ¹ Such court-customs, Gressmann believes are reflected in early Jewish writings, particularly in psalm 110. The origin of the idea of Messiah is closely bound up with ² the eschatological hopes of a returning King of Paradise. Among the Amorites it was connected with the ancient dynasty of the priest-king Melchizedek. For them Melchizedek represented the returning King of Paradise in the Golden Age; and for the Israelites the returning King of Paradise was identified with David. Thus one of the chief and earliest sources of the Jewish Messianic hope was this Amoritish identification of Melchizedek with the returning-King of ³ Paradise.

It is frequently remarked that the popular Jewish Messianic expectation is always associated with the Davidic dynasty. But this in turn has been thought to involve nothing but the political aspect of the Davidic dynasty. It is possible that in the popular mind such was the case. However, a new impression of the meaning of Davidic Messiahship is revealed when we consider the non-political functions of David and the non-political capacity which clearly were from the beginning contained in the conception of Messiahship - based as they were upon an ideal David. The Messianic expectation which took as its background the reign of David, cannot be rightly/

1. Ibid. supra p.23

2. Gressmann affirms that the idea of a Kingdom of the Messiah was as old, if not older, than the idea of the Kingdom of Jehovah. See *ibid.* pp.278,279. He writes "a redemptive period without a King simply cannot be imagined". p.279.

3. Ibid. supra, p.278.

rightly understood apart from the occasion and circumstances attending the institution of the first Davidic rule.

¹
Gressmann writes:

"A new epoch in the history of Kingship began when David conquered the Amorite town of Jerusalem and made it the royal town of his kingdom. From this time the royal family of David and the Amorite house of Jerusalem were closely bound up - Melchizedek appearing as the ancestor of the latter. The Jewish Kings laid weight upon representing their ascendancy as the justly inherited continuation of the Amorites and upon regarding themselves as priest-kings after the manner of Melchizedek."

The Israelites, according to Gressmann, influenced by the court-styles of Egypt, Babylonia and Phoenicia, celebrated the accession of their Kings from the time of David in the manner depicted in the 110th psalm. Here in the exaggerated language which characterized the court-style of the time, the king is regarded by the singer as the anointed returning-king of Paradise who combines the offices of priest and king. The king is not the Messiah; the idea of Messiah arises out of the ideal form in which the king is represented, and from the custom of anointing him as the returning king of Paradise, who combined both offices in his person.² Jewish Messianism, is thus, from the beginning, associated with an idealized David who is a priest after the order of Melchizedek.

The plausibility of these views are of course for the most part dependent upon the early dating of psl.110. There has been a preponderance of scholarly opinion towards placing it/

1. Ibid.supra p.51

2. See ibid.supra.pp.277,278.

it in the Maccabae¹an period. Simon Maccabaeus is thought to be the subject of it (1 Mac.14:41), though Simon never really claimed the title of King (1 Mac.13:34-39), being nothing but a tributary vassal. Even among those who argue for the late date there is no unity of opinion as to the exact historical figure represented. Some see the figure of John Hyrcanus who succeeded Simon in 135 (Test Levi 8:3, 15:1 Mac.14:8-15)² or of Alexander Jannaeus. In the first place it is doubtful if any of these heroes ever possessed sufficient kingly dignity to warrant such an effusion on royalty as Psalm 110. Oesterley claims that the coins of John Hyrcanus and those of his son Aristobulus, lacked the Royal³ title. Again in the matter of the priesthood the Psalm cannot refer to any one who claimed to be high-priest of the Jews in the ordinary sense. By birth these heroes were of the line of Aaron and although they delighted to picture themselves after the manner of the ancient king of Salem, they did not think of their priestly office as differing at all from the customary Aaronic office.⁴ In the 110th Psalm, the emphasis is upon the distinction of the priestly office of the king, "as after the order of Melchizedek".

Moore/

1. Cheyne "Origin of the Psalter", p.24
2. Charles "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha", Vol.11, p. 300.
3. See Oesterley: "A History of Israel", vol.11, p.288.
4. Gressmann, *ibid.*supra, says: "It is fairly certain that in the post-exilic period they had not made any Amorite their founder", p.24.

1

Moore observes:

"In everything excepting the breaking of the heads of the heathen people (Psl.110) the Asmonaeen kings at the height of their power were at a remote extreme from the ideal of the ruler in the golden age as he is pictured in Is.2:1-5, 9:6. It is very unlikely that biblical scholars of the time as a class and a party of the Pharisees were inclined to bestow upon those priests who mounted the throne the predictions of the restoration of the legitimate monarchy."

This, together with the evidences, which Gressmann adduces from his study of the psalm in relation to the court-style of the primitive oriental epoch, make the Maccabaeen dating of the psalm still more questionable. Gressmann indicates how that the overthrowing of the enemy (110:1) is a familiar theme throughout the court-style, adducing many examples of it in Egyptian, Amorite and Assyrian inscriptions. The fact too that here as in Psl.2 the king is the Son of God, and in virtue of which he is made a priest for eternity, corresponds to the common designation of the kings at the time. He writes:

"It is not absolutely certain but distinctly possible that Melchizedek was already extolled as the Son of God, born on the holy mountain."

The probability that this tradition underlies such passages as Is.14, may throw considerable light upon the perplexing problem which scholars have seen to underlie the close association of Sonship and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Gressmann contends, in addition, that the marked evidence of the use in such psalms as 45, 2, 110 of the king's oracle, corresponding to the/

1. "Judaism", Vol.11, ch.2, see p.328.
2. "Der Messias". An exact correspondence is shown with an Assyrian inscription "I am the mighty King, favourite of the Gods, an offspring of Rulers, whose Priesthood from time immemorial Enlil has extolled", p.24. Further examples furnished on pages 51-56.

the style and form of other king's songs of the time, is proof of their non-Maccabaic origin. In the Maccabaic period no such oracles existed because the mouth of prophecy was silenced according to general belief and accepted tradition. "It is impossible to believe that such conceptions as the adoption of the king by the deity (Psl.2), the corporal begetting of the king by the deity in (Psl.110) and the presiding of the king as deity (Psl.45), were possible to the Judaism of the Maccabaic period¹."

Objection has been taken by some to an early date for the Psalm on the grounds that Gen.14 belongs to one of the latest sections of the Pentateuch and that^{the} Melchizedek episode is a later insertion. But the reliability of the text has been demonstrated². Hommel sees two stories in the account (Gen.14:17-), and thinks that the reference to Melchizedek is the earlier of the recensions and that it is not a later interpolation, otherwise the matter which follows would not make sense if the king of Sodom is the subject of the account. He writes: "Probably the original which seems to have been written in Babylonia was rescued from the archives of the Temple at Jerusalem".³

The genuineness of the traditional setting which Genesis 14 gives to Psalm 110 is assured. It is certain that Melchizedek is an Amorite name and so are those of Abraham's three friends. Boutflower identifies Amraphel, King of Shinar (14:1) with Hammurabi (2067-2024 B.C.)⁴ But as yet there is not/

1. "Der Messias", pp.196,197.

2. Peake; "Hebrews", p.90.

3. "Ancient Hebrew Tradition", p.153.

4. Psl.110 (authorship) Genesis XIV (its historical character) pp.41,42.

not sufficient evidence for exact dating within that period.¹
The Davidic authorship still finds many scholarly champions.
Konig thinks it was written by David upon the occasion of
the anointing of Solomon.² If the authorship is uncertain
the subject of the song is either Solomon or David. The
fact that either one was so addressed or so conceived himself
must have exerted a moulding influence upon the whole con-
:ception of kingship while the Southern Kingdom lasted; and
it is to be expected that their priest-kingly office should be
reflected in later Messianic ideals.

Our contention, that the beginnings of Jewish Messian-
:ism are bound up with the figure of Melchizedek whom David
emulated, is fully warranted by the evidence for the early
pre-exilic date of the 110th Psalm. Before examining other
Old Testament prophetic passages for the recurrence and
importance of this idea of the priesthood of the Messiah, it
is necessary, first of all, to investigate the status of the
priest-king idea in pre-exilic, post-exilic and Maccabaeon
times. If the office of priest is associated with kingship
in Israelitish history, it is natural to expect that those
same features would characterize the expected Messiah. But
the full consideration of this matter must be reserved for
discussion in the following chapter.

That the Davidic dynasty was founded upon the Mel-
chizedekian ideal finds ample proof apart from the evidence
of Psalm 110. belonging to Davidic times. In 2 Sam.6:13-20,
David/

1. See *ibid.* pp.25

2. *Ibid.* supra.p.150

David offered burnt offerings and peace offerings (verses 13,17), he was girt with the linen ephod (verse 14), and to everyone he dealt a cake of bread and a portion of flesh (R.V.margin "of wine"), he blesses the people (ver.18). In these actions of David, especially in the assumption of the priestly dress, the blessing of the people and the distribution of the bread and the wine, there is a close and seemingly conscious imitation of Melchizedek. Wellhausen remarks on the incident: "David sacrificed upon the occasion of his bringing the ark to Jerusalem, that it was he himself who officiated appears from the fact that he wore the priestly ephod and at the close of the offering pronounced the benediction"¹. A similar function is assigned to Solomon (1 Kings 8:63,64) where he presents the offering at the dedication of the Temple. Jeraboam (1 Kings 13:1) misuses his priestly office at the heathen alter.

The prophetic references to this priest-kingly idea are few but definite. In Jer.30:21 the Davidic king himself is clearly promised the right of drawing near to God without dying.² Again the figure of the priest-king is reflected in the servant songs, particularly in that of the Suffering Servant.³ So in Zechariah the perfect David "The Shoot" is represented as combining the offices of priesthood and kingship in the manner of the ancient founder of the dynasty.⁴

1. "History of Israel", p.33.

2. See Schultz: "Old Testament Theology" Vol.11, p.427.

3. The validity of viewing both Is.53 and the Messianic passages in Zechariah (part 1) as based upon the ancient priest-king idea will be shown in the chapter to follow.

4. Koënig ibid.supra, p.270.

dynasty. It is at this point in post-exilic history that there occurs the first real division of Kingship - the first real division of Church and State.

The scanty reference, in the Old Testament scriptures, to the priest-king idea is an enigma in view of the prominence which the idea certainly was given at the founding of the Davidic dynasty. It is one of the many problems of Old Testament history which requires further investigation. Commenting upon the fact of Psl.110 being the only extant¹ passage expressly calling the king "Priest", Gressmann writes:

"That can be explained by the revision of the Old Testament text by the later priests and scribes, to whom above all the King's privilege of entering the Holy of Holies was a horror. This is proved by the legend of leprosy of King Uzziah, which must have arisen not later than 4th century B.C. Only the Messianic interpretation of this Psalm has protected it from later encroachments".

Some deep-rooted prejudice of this nature must lie behind such a conspicuous absence. The post-exilic high-priest may have regarded himself as the rightful heir of the priest-king and would naturally enough work towards the suppression of an historic tradition which might lead to the resumption of the dual office by some king or aspirant. Whatever the cause of the silence of the Old Testament scriptures, the revival of the idea by the Asmonaeon House is proof that the priest-king conception was by no means a dead letter.

At the outset there is the problem of accounting for the appropriation of a title, which was always associated with the Davidic House, by those who were definitely of Levitic/

1. Der Messias, p.24.

Levitic lineage. Josephus to whom we are indebted for most of our knowledge of this period of Jewish history throw¹ no light upon the problem. The displeasure which the Pharisees showed towards the later claimants of this title may have, as Oesterley asserts, been due to the fact they hoped for a theocratic state; and if there was to be a King of the people of God, then it could be justified only in one² who was of the House of David. But unless there was complete ignorance of the traditional association of the House of David with Melchizedek, it is difficult to understand their opposition not also involving a dispute of the Asmonaeon use of the title.

It is fairly certain that at this late time there remained no reliable tradition apart from the 110th Psalm, from which it could have been ascertained that the title was used by the Davidic House. Most of the references to Priest-Kingly office were lacking in the scriptures to which they had access at the time due to the priestly redaction of which mention has been made. (p.109). Still it is possible that among the learned members of the party, this knowledge existed. In that case we can readily understand/

1. Antiquities (XVI vi:2) where mention is made of their assumption of the title based on Gen.XIV: 18.

2. "A History of Israel", p.288.

understand the Pharisees' opposition as being occasioned by the Asmonæan misuse of the title "Priest-King after the order of Melchizedek".

In spite of the silence of Jewish writings of the time on the matter, it may be that there is an echo of such a protest on the part of the Pharisees, in the textual interpolations in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. In the original work, the Messiah is to be descended from Levi, but later a compromise seems to have been attempted for a Messiah from Judah reappears in Testament Judah and Testament Naphali,¹ Charles asserts that these additions were made in the first century B.C., and concludes that the hope of a Messiah from Judah was abandoned for some thirty or forty years. However, the fact that a protest was not registered until the time of this later redaction is scarcely evidence that a Messiah from Levi completely occupied the field of Messianic hope during those years of silence on a Davidic Messiah. Nor is it clear that the protest was/

1. "The Testament of the XII Patriarchs" (London 1908). See his "Introduction".

was occasioned solely by a¹ divergence of party Messianic hopes, such as appears to have existed between the Pharisees and the Sadducees in later times. It is more than probable that the claim of the Asmonaeans to the title which the Davidic kings had inherited from the Amorite Chief Melchizedek lies at the root of the controversy. It is true that during the first century the controversy was mainly restricted to a mutual denial on the part of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, of their respective Messianic hopes. The actual redactions which were attempted in the text of ~~Τῆς~~ Παλαιᾶς^h also lead to further conclusions. It was clearly not in the spirit of compromise that this controversy was waged between the two Jewish parties. What is known of the history of the two parties points to very little relationship on the basis of compromise. If a redaction of the text was undertaken by a scribe of either of these orthodox Jewish parties, it is doubtful if he would have been satisfied with a changing of the text in a manner which would include the Messianic hopes of both. But the alteration and additions made, seem to have been executed by one who was inspired to his task by something more than the contemporary party issue.

The redaction has something more at the back of it than a party quarrel. In the text it cannot be said that either party's belief is rescued from obscurity. If any motive there was it is shown to embrace a larger national ideal. Plainly an attempt is being made, not at mere inclusion, as is thought, but at a uniting of the Levitic and Davidic Messianic hopes./

See

1. E.R.E. vol.XI. article "The Sadducees", p.44.

hopes. The redactor appears to have in his mind the validity of both hopes and their mergence into one great Messianic expectation of the coming of one who was not distinctly a priest or distinctly a king by nature, but one who combined both those offices in his person. The popular hope of the Pharisees emphasized his kingly character, whereas with the Sadducees the priestly qualifications may be said to have beenⁱⁿ the fore-¹front. The redactor has in mind One who combines these two offices in equality. That such is his purpose is evidenced² in the following from Testament of Simeon:

"And now my children, obey Levi and Judah, and be not lifted up against these tribes, for from them shall arise unto you the salvation of God. For God shall raise up from Levi as it were a High-priest, and from Judah as it were a king. He shall save all the races of Israel" (7:1).

It is conceivably an attempt on his part to correct the one-sided emphasis upon the priestly aspect of the Levite Messiah. Between the lines of his textual alteration, can be read, a silent protest against the Asmonaeon misuse of a title in which the kingly and priestly offices were once on a par.

The fact that this larger national ideal was at the basis of the first century redaction is proven from the Messianic passages which have undergone no alteration. Apparently they were regarded as having given expression to the early Davidic Messianic ideal, and were not concerned with the mere assertion of a Messianic priesthood from Levi. Party hopes are/

1. That the Sadducees held a belief in Messiah from Levi is opinion of many scholars. See Oesterley and Box. (Books of the Apocrypha pp. 148 ff). It is doubtful, however, if the party as a whole held this view.
2. The quotations are all from R.H. Charles' two volumes of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

are quite in the background if distinguishable at all in the following (Test. of Levi 8:2-15):

"Arise put on the robe of priesthood and the crown of righteousness and the garment of truth and the plate of understanding, and the garment of truth and the plate of faith and the turban of the head and the ephod of prophecy, and they severally carried these things and put them on me and said unto me. From henceforth become a priest of the Lord, Thou and thy seed forever. And the first anointed me with holy oil (1), and gave me the staff of Judgment. The second washed me with pure water and fed me with bread and wine.....The fifth gave me a branch of rich olive. The sixth placed a crown upon my head. The seventh placed a diadem of priesthood on my head, that I might serve as a priest to the Lord God..... And the third shall be called by a new name because a king shall arise in Judah and shall establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles."

Though the subject is John Hyrcanus, the emphasis is not upon a Messiah from Levi, but envisages a Messiah who is above party distinctions/

(1)

The anointing with oil, a custom inherited from the peoples of the Near East by Israel. Of the custom Pressman writes (Der Messias p.4) "In the post-exilic literature 'the anointed' refers originally only to the high priest and the custom of pouring on the oil which at first is limited only to him is extended to all priests later. Thus the significance of this custom is determined also for the pre-exilic time: it indicates consecration as priest-king. For this reason, therefore, ordinary priests were not anointed - any more than they were in the first period after the exile - for there was only one anointed person: the king as the highest priest. The post-exilic high priest is the rightful heir of the priest-king and has taken over from him both the title and the customs - a fact which for easily conceived reasons has been passed over in silence and, as far as possible expunged in the priestly revision of the Old testament literature. Such a transference is, however, only conceivable upon one pre-supposition, that the anointing had a priestly significance and that this significance was known also in the later period."

The writer of the Levi passage seems well aware of the original king-priest significance of the anointing and consequently the more reason we have for assuming that both he and the redactor of the other passage have in mind the fulfilment of the ancient priest-king Messianic hope untrammelled by contemporary party hopes.

are quite in the background if distinguishable at all in the following (Test. of Levi 8:2-15):

"Arise put on the robe of priesthood and the crown of righteousness and the garment of truth and the plate of understanding, and the garment of truth and the plate of faith and the turban of the head and the ephod of prophecy, and they severally carried these things and put them on me and said unto me. From henceforth become a priest of the Lord, Thou and thy seed forever. And the first anointed me with holy oil (1), and gave me the staff of Judgment. The second washed me with pure water and fed me with bread and wine.....The fifth gave me a branch of rich olive. The sixth placed a crown upon my head. The seventh placed a diadem of priesthood on my head, that I might serve as a priest to the Lord God..... And the third shall be called by a new name because a king shall arise in Judah and shall establish a new priesthood after the fashion of the Gentiles."

Though the subject is John Hyrcanus, the emphasis is not upon a Messiah from Levi, but envisages a Messiah who is above party distinctions/

(1)

The anointing with oil, a custom inherited from the peoples of the Near East by Israel. Of the custom Pressman writes (Der Messiah p.4) "In the post-exilic literature the anointed refers originally only to the high priest and the custom of pouring on the oil which at first is limited only to him is extended to all priests later. Thus the significance of this custom is determined also for the pre-exilic time: it indicates consecration as priest-king. For this reason, therefore, ordinary priests were not anointed - any more than they were in the first period after the exile - for there was only one anointed person: the king as the highest priest. The post-exilic high priest is the rightful heir of the priest-king and has taken over from him both the title and the customs - a fact which for easily conceived reasons has been passed over in silence and, as far as possible expunged in the priestly revision of the Old testament literature. Such a transference is, however, only conceivable upon one presupposition, that the anointing had a priestly significance and that this significance was known also in the later period."

The writer of the Levi passage seems well aware of the original king-priest significance of the anointing and consequently the more reason we have for assuming that both he and the redactor of the other passage have in mind the fulfilment of the ancient priest-king Messianic hope untrammelled by contemporary party hopes.

distinctions, whose dignity is not dependent upon birth.

The emphasis is rather upon his dual office, the olive branch referring to^{the} Messianic union of the offices of Joshua and Zerrubbabel (Zec.4), as it is also upon the newness of the priesthood to be inaugurated.

The acquiescence of the redactor in the non-partizan Messianic hopes of these writings is further illustrated by Test. Levi 18:12.

"And after their punishment, the Lord shall raise up a new priest. And to him all the words of the Lord shall be revealed.....And his star shall arise in the heavens as of a king... And there shall be peace on the earth....The heavens shall be opened and from the temple of glory shall come upon him sanctification with the Father's voice as from Abraham to Isaac. And the glory of the most High shall be uttered over him and the spirit of understanding and sanctification..for evermore." And there shall none succeed/

1. The influence which the Testament of the XII Patriarchs had upon the New Testament literature is computed by Charles (Section 26 of the introduction on the same, London 1908). We may be sure that if the ethical influence of the books was what Charles asserts it to have been upon the New Testament writers and upon Jesus Himself, that the Messianic hopes contained therein must have also exerted their influence upon His Messianic consciousness. Indeed the Gospels themselves bear eloquent testimony that probably even at His baptism the vision of the heavens opening and the words uttered over Him correspond in a most striking manner to the consecration of the priest-kingly Messiah as portrayed in (T.Levi 18:1-12 and also in T.Judah 24:1-3). Judah 24:1-3 "And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace. And a man shall arise like the Son of Righteousness walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness; and no sin shall be found in him. And the heavens shall be opened unto Him to pour out the spirit and the blessing of the Holy Father." The influence of such priestly Messianic passages upon the mind of the early church and upon the mind of Jesus Himself has not been as yet sufficiently taken into account when estimating the traditional validity of that doctrine as it is set forth in the Epistle to The Hebrews. If we knew definitely that the additional Christian interpolation took place in the first century A.D., the case would be even stronger for the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ in the early Church. For the addition, thought to be Christian, runs: "the blameless one shall die for ungodly men (in the blood of the covenant for the salvation of the Gentiles)". If the bracketed part, as Charles thinks, is the only Christian addition then its early influence is assured.

succeed him forever upon the earth. And in his priesthood the Gentiles shall be multiplied in knowledge upon the earth, and enlightened through the grace of God. And in his priesthood shall sin come to an end and the lawless shall cease to do evil. And he shall open the gates of Paradise¹....and shall give to the saints to eat of the tree of life.²...And Beliar shall be bound by him. And he shall give power to his children".

What we have in this Messianic hymn goes far beyond a mere claim for Messiahship from Levi, and the redactor of the Testaments clearly recognized the fact. For him, it must have been the fullest embodiment of the ancient priestly Messianic ideal which transcended all sectarian ideals. The same may be said of the other Messianic passages in the Testaments, whether in their original form as in T.Reuben 6:7-12, T.of Dan.5:10, T. of Jos.19:5-9, or in their redacted state as in T.Jud.24:5-7. The Messiah pictured has little Pharisaic or Sadducean prejudice left and has become the realized ideal of the ancient Jewish hope expressed in the 110th Psalm, the Suffering Servant and the Messiah typified in the combined offices of Joshua and Zerubbabel.

However the adoption of the priest-kingly title by the Asmonaeon House may be accounted for, in view of their Levitic lineage, the fact remains that they did so and apparently without any scruple. Whether they were ignorant of its historic/

1. Charles remarks that this is the only passage in Jewish literature which ascribes to the Messiah the opening of Paradise. However, it seems to have had a great deal to do with the thought of the ascension in the early Church. It is at least suggestive of the symbolism which occurs in the Gospel account of the rending of the veil.
2. Compare with Rev.20:1-3 and 22:2.

historic association with the Davidic dynasty or not cannot be determined. At any rate, they ignored that matter and were well content that it expressed their ideal and ambition to be head, as we would say to-day, of both Church and State. The founding of the Asmonaeon House upon this order is described in 1 Macc.14:25-48 : "And the Jews and the priests were well pleased that Simon should be their leader and high-priest for ever, until a faithful prophet should arise (verse 41)".¹ The author of the Book of Jubilees is either unaware of the Davidic claim to the title or he intentionally passes over it and in recording the historic tradition which underlay his heroes' claim to the title, mentioned only the meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek (13:25-32), "And he abode that night at Bethel and Levi dreamed that they had made him a priest of the most High God, and his sons forever".

The adoption of the title priest-king after the order of Melchizedek by the Asmonaeon House was the occasion of the revival of something of the ancient Messianic hope frequently expressed in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal writings: many of these Messianic passages we have already had occasion to refer to. Still there remains to be mentioned another late document which also embodies an approximation to the early idealistic Messianic hope, the Zadokite Fragment. However, the Messianic passages here are written with a decided animus towards/

1. Charles thinks that for this writer the Messianic era had already set in, and that this thought was often cherished in Maccabaeon times of prosperity. "Book of Jubilees", p.116.

towards Judah. In fact they present a perfect illustration of the distinction between purely party Messianic hopes and the larger vision which we have seen characterized ~~xxx~~ the original and redacted sections of the Testament of the XII Patriarchs. Throughout the whole text of the Zadokite Fragment ¹ this opposition to the Davidic dynasty is to be seen. The fact of its late dating may account for this extraordinary difference with the Testaments. Charles placed it about the year 18 B.C. It was during the first century B.C., that the abject failure of the Asmonaeon House came about. In consequence "there was a quick and eager return of the Pharisees to the Davidic hope in its fullest political sense". ² It is to be expected that this enthusiastic body of reformers within the Sadducee party would endeavour to counteract the movement away from a priest-kingly Messiah by an unprecedented emphasis upon a priestly Messiah from Aaron and Israel. From the emphatic insistence upon the fact that they alone formed the true priesthood of Israel (5:7, 6:1-20), it is inferable that some other type of priesthood must have had some recognition to justify this polemic. But the only other type of priesthood which appears to have played any part in Jewish history is that after the order of Melchizedek - and it, so far as we know, could never have had the status of a priestly order in the sense that the Aaronic had. But in any case its revival, in Maccabaeon times, must have in part occasioned the Zadokite stress/

1. The text used here is that of Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work".
2. See Lightly: "Jewish Sects and Parties during the Time of Christ", p.88.

1

stress upon the Levitical priesthood. It adds additional force to our contention that there had existed from a certain time in the history of Israel a priestly protest against recognizing or recording the anointing of priest-kings. That the prejudice was long standing and deep rooted is evidenced by its late outcropping among the Zadokite group.

The strictly party bias given to their Messianic hope is indicated in the following passages:

9:9,10 "They that give heed unto them are the poor of the flock; they shall be handed over to the sword when the Messiah comes from Aaron and Israel".

15:4 "And this is the regulation of the dwellers according to which act during the period of the wickedness until there arises the Messiah from Aaron and Israel".

24:8 And this is the explanation of the judgment ... (the Messiah) from Aaron and Israel".

There is nothing to indicate that there remained at all among this group the popular Sadducaic Messianic hope bound up as it was with the priest-kingly ideal of the Asmonaeans. In fact we hold that the Fragment contains evidence of a twofold polemic, one against the Davidic and the other a disparagement of anything which would suggest the legitimacy of any other order than that of the Levitical.

This indirect protest of the Zadokite sect against the recognition of any other priesthood argues for the persistence, even among the Sadducaic party in spite of the Asmonaeon failure, of the priest-kingly ideal. It is apparent that it was no/

1. The Zadokites regarded the words of Exekiel 44:15 as having been particularly addressed to them (5:7).
2. Neither Leszynski, Charles or Schechter suggest that there is this dual motive present in the Work, nevertheless, it is thought that the contention is justified when the Work is considered in the light of the attendant circumstances mentioned.

no dead issue even at the beginning of the Christian era. It has been too readily taken for granted that the downfall of the Asmonaeans meant the abandonment of the hope which John Hyrcanus had awakened among the Jews, of the complete freedom of the Jewish people, if not under him, at least at the coming of a priest-kingly Messiah. Even after their downfall there is reason to believe that the literature which grew up around the achievements of these heroes had a far-reaching influence.¹ Oesterley seriously questions the common opinion of scholars that there was no longer any respect for the idea of a priest-kingly regime. He asserts that the Jewish people were disappointed when Herod was appointed in place of Antigonus. The popular choice of the people at so late a time was still for one who united in himself the spiritual and civil power. Of this popular feeling Oesterley writes:²

"The hatred shown to Herod was partly due to the fact that he had displaced the Hasmonaean dynasty. The Sadducees and their following had by this time become greatly attached to the Hasmonaeans; and even the Pharisees thought of the time when under the rulers of this house they had been an independent nation; and though they did not love the Hasmonaeans, they acquiesced in their rule....Herod was the first to break what had become a tradition (i.e. the civil and spiritual rulership being centred in one person)".

As we have had reason to believe this sacred tradition goes back, much beyond the era of the Maccabaeans, to the time of David himself. It was surely an instance of the unconscious revival of an ideal which lay at the root of Israel's national life. That it was the germinal idea in Israel's highest Messianic hopes of the past will be the burden of the following chapter.

1. W.O.E.Oesterley: "A History of Israel" claims that it exercised a great influence through oral teachers, p.321.
2. Ibid. p.353.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE MESSIAH (Contd).

Our conclusions that the 110 Psalm expresses the earliest form of Hebrew Messianic hope, (i.e. the returning King of Paradise in the person of David) necessitate the further enquiry as to whether the idea of a priest-kingly Messiah persisted in Hebrew Messianic thought, during exilic and post-exilic times.

Isaiah 53 In the first place our concern will be to examine the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah, considering in particular that of the Suffering Servant of Jahweh. In spite of the strong arguments which certain modern scholars advance for a late dating of the Psalter and many of the servant songs - indeed of the whole composition of the Book of Isaiah¹, a number of competent Old Testament scholars continue to favour the period of the exile for Isaiah 53, (Skinner, Torrey, Welch, Barnes, Gressmann, König).

It is not to be imagined that Jewish Messianic prophecy was subjected to one controlling principle, the development of which can be traced from early pre-exilic times to late post-exilic. There are too many shades of Messianic opinion met with in the Old Testament to justify the working out of a harmonious picture of its development. However, in a general way, it may be said that the ideas of the kingly qualification of the Messiah and also the qualities of the priest, are found side by side just at/

1. Kennett for instance in "Old Testament Essays" assigns the whole Psalter to the Maccabaeen age and also Is. XLIX:1-9, L:4-9, LII:13 - LIII, p.227.

at those points, in Hebrew prophecy, when the Messianic expectation attains its highest and most ideal form. To that extent Messianic prophecy may be said to have been controlled by one overruling principle. The 53rd Chapter of Isaiah is one of those high points when the ideal finds its noblest expression.

The Song bristles with difficulties for the interpreter. In the first place, is the subject an historical or ideal figure of faith? And in either case is it the nation in exile which is represented or a persecuted individual? In the next place does the singer represent the death of the Servant as having taken place in the past or is the death referred to the future? The answer, of ecclesiastical tradition, to both questions has been that the prophecy referred to Christ. And after a manner they were quite correct. This was the interpretation of the early Church, and we have every reason to believe that it was so interpreted by Jesus Himself. But in no more than the most idealistic religious sense can we say that it was made with direct reference to our Lord.

An opinion which has met with wide acceptance is that the Servant is representative of the historic nation of Israel. The suffering of the Jewish community in exile is focussed in the life of one who is conceived as a moral individual throughout the song. There are sound reasons for this view, among which^{is} the dire plight of the nation, at the time in exile, which corresponds closely at many points with the Servant in his suffering and humiliation and obedience unto death. Then, too, it is exemplary of a characteristic tendency of the Hebrew mind to think of its own national life or that of an enemy's state in/

in terms of an individual. The mediatorial office of God's¹ chosen people is thought to have been a popular conception.

Reichm writes:

"Israel, as God's chosen and peculiar people, will continue to be even in the last time, and with conservation of his national idiosyncrasy, the kernel of the people of God, assuming as a nation a position of royalty in the messianic kingdom and fulfilling the priestly function of mediator between God and man".²

The opinion that it is the nation which is represented in the song fits very well into this characteristic disposition of the Hebrew mind. But there is so much in the passage which has no parallel in the experience of the nation either during or after the exile - for one cannot speak of the sorrows and death of³ Israel - that one has the feeling that the poet has either a definite historical individual in mind, such as a Jeremiah, or he has idealized some historical individual, that he is no longer recognizable.

Gressmann attributes to Messianic prophecy a consistent principle/

1. See R.L.Ottley "Some Aspects of the Old Testament", p.310.
2. Reichm: "Messianic Prophecy", p.238.
3. It is though that the Song properly begins at (52:13-15) with a promise made by Jehovah Himself, and concludes with a second promise spoken by Deutero-Isaiah (53:10-12). The middle portion resembles the penitential Psalms (53:1-9), but the thought is cast more in the form of a future prediction. The air of mystery which the writer shrouds the subject from the beginning suggests that the whole action lies in the future, but that it concerns a mysterious being whom the writer's imagination had projected into a time to come. It is the Israelites themselves who in this section (1-9) voice their sentiments. So that it is difficult to conceive of the writer's thought being that it is Israel mourning for Israel, Israel dying for Israel, or even the poet's thought of the nations suffering having produced this picture.

principle of working. It amounts to the poetic idealization of a definite historical personality. In the case of the ¹ Suffering Servant he asserts:

"We must take as starting point, a king of whom there is proof - or at least it is most likely - that he was honoured as a Messiah - or at least that he gave occasion for messianic hopes. Secondly this king must have been particularly pious and must have corresponded very closely to the prophetic ideal seeing that the offices of prophet and king merged almost of themselves."

Gressmann's theory has everything to commend it except that of the difficulty he has in finding an actual king who could have inspired such a representation. This he thinks can be done to a degree of accuracy by an examination of the Songs for the Dead; and thus by a process of elimination arrive at a figure ² which is most closely paralleled in the poem. Whatever competent Old Testament scholarship may have to say of the theory, it looks more plausible than the former view in that it accounts for more of the details, for example, those in this 53rd chapter. The fact that it is not an actual figure but an idealized one, explains the unusual imagery which adorns the picture. Most commendatory is the consistency with which the theory may be applied to Messianic prophecy. Moreover it is an explanation, which as Gressmann claims, accords with the prevalent court style of the ancient Orient. Then most important of all it furnishes a definite proof, we believe, that the splendour of Messianic prophetic achievement lies in a more resplendent era of the Hebrew national life than that of the Maccabaeae times.

Our/

1. "Der Messias", p.323.
2. See "Der Messias", pp.323-326.

Our concern is not with the identification of the historic figure, but with the fact that this interpretation of the Song places it en rapport with the fundamental idea contained in Psl.110. Here, as in this earlier Davidic Psalm, is the priest-king, conceived in an idealized form, and presenting, in its highest form of perfection, the ancient national ideal Messiah - a priest^{king} of God after the manner of Melchizedek.¹

That such is the figure represented in this Song is no new discovery; it is but the corroboration of the opinion of some of the ablest scholarship of the past century. It was the conviction of many that there was a unique relationship existing between the Suffering Servant song and Psalm 110. Just the extent of that relationship was not completely indicated, but it was eloquently affirmed that Isaiah 53 could not be fully understood apart from Psl.110:4. Chief among the exponents of this view were Hengstenberg² and Delitzsch³. The latter writes of this prophecy:

"All forms of the previous representation of redemption removed from their isolation are united in the person of the Servant of Jahweh, the prophet like Moses, the king Messiah, the priest after the order of Melchizedek".

In a somewhat similar manner, Ottley⁴, Schultz⁵ and Rehm⁶ combine in/

1. Though Skinner is unaware that Psl.110 depicts the national ideal of a priest-king, he states: "If he (the Suffering Servant) be an individual he is almost necessarily to be identified with the ideal King", (p.144 Commentary).
2. "Christology of the Old Testament", see pp.300 ff.
3. "Messianic Prophecies", p.203.
4. "Some Aspects of the Old Testament", pp.310 f.
5. "Old Testament Theology", p.827.
6. "Old Testament Theology", p.257 and "Messianic Prophecy", p.199.

Chapter VII

in seeing the Servant not as a teacher but as a priest, who, in order to expiate our sins, offers Himself up as a sacrifice.

If many of these scholars of the past century regarded the Song as an explicit prophecy of the sacrifice of Christ which He offered up once for all outside the gate, or as having its complete and perfect fulfilment in Christ, they were to a great extent justified. For though the Song may have been composed on the death of a king, the idealized form in which the event is depicted makes the reference, as to the death of the Servant, apply to the future. The efficacy of the death lay, not in the actual dying of an historic person, but in a projected figure of the poet's mind, the death of whom should have atoning value. This mysterious personage - "a form of faith and fantasy and not a real man of flesh and blood"¹ - actually took human form in history; and we believe was inspired by the picture of the Suffering Servant, a priest-kingly Messiah, to accomplish in His own life and death its Divine fulfilment.

1 Zechariah There is reason to believe that the re-establishment of Judaism after the exile marked the point at which the political and ecclesiastical functions of the king² were first definitely divided. In Zechariah (6:11-14) Zerrubabel is the theocratic prince while Joshua holds the corresponding dignity of the high priest of the nation. The special prominence which an Aaronic priesthood comes to take in the ideally restored nation is depicted by Ezekiel (44:10-28, 48:11-). That/

1. "Der Messias", p.303.

2. See Oesterley: "History of Israel", p.83 and "Der Messias", p.264.

Chapter VII

That the division of the kingly and priestly office was not recognized, until this post-exilic time, scholarship has pretty generally conceded; but that priesthood was attached to the Messianic conception of the ideal king like David has not been so generally recognized. Just how this, the natural implication from the Davidic ideal, could be avoided is incomprehensible. However, we have not only the implication of the ideal Davidic kingship (Psl.110) from which to infer the priesthood of the Messiah. Doubtless the political qualifications of the ideal David are those emphasized in our extant text of Hebrew scriptures. However, König is of the opinion, that to the kingly office of the ultimate successor of David, the office of priest attached itself. This not only from the fact of the pre-exilic anointing of Kings and the testimony of Psl. 110, but also from the definite references to this union of the kingly and priestly offices in Jer.30:21.¹ The allusion to the Messiah in this passage is as a rule understood thus: "that God intends to introduce him as high priest - for who will otherwise dare to approach unto me", which is tantamount² to saying who else will dare to play the role of high priest? König is of the opinion that this passage may be compared with such other prophecies as Is.44:3, 45:17- , Zech.6:13- , all³ of which express the priest-kingly Messiahship. The tendency of Messianic prophecy was to stress more and more, as time went on/

1. König: "Die Messianischen Weissagungen", pp.342,343.
2. See Gressmann: "ibid.supra", p.326.
3. See "Die Messianischen Weissagungen," pp.271 and 343.

on, this qualification by which the future Saviour might have the privilege of the closest relationship with God.¹ This is not always explicitly stated as co-terminous with priesthood but the primary implication seems to have been such. The tendency finally led to the identification of the Redeemer with God as in Mal.3:1.

Certainly the references to the ideal priest-kingly Messiah in the first part of Zechariah are too explicit to be argued away. The determination of the meaning of the reference in Zach.3:8b, my servant "Semach" has been one of the chief difficulties. The messianic reference has been largely explained away on the grounds that "Semach" is Zerrubabel (Barnes, Skinner, Cheyne²). But the words which follow "behold" point directly to the future as the period of the "Shoot". König concludes that not only is the future indicated, but that the "Shoot" is from David.³ That such is the use of the word, throughout the passages 4:1-14 and 6:1-15, cannot reasonably be doubted. Barnes, on 6:11-13, would have it that is is Zerrubabel who is to build the Temple and Joshua who is to stand beside the throne. But it is the "Shoot" which is subject of the verbs which follow, "He will build the temple and be a priest/

1. See *ibid.* pp.136 and 343.
2. In the Bampton Lectures 1922, by taking advantage of a corrupt text, Cheyne does explain away this direct reference in Old Testament to priesthood of the Messiah, but neither Gressmann nor König find anything even in an altered text to support such conclusions as Cheyne and others arrive at.
3. *Ibid.* pp.267-269.

¹
 priest upon his throne". The character and function of the
 "Shoot" are clearly set forth here. The crown described in
 the plural in (ver.11) is symbolical of the priesthood and king-
 :ship which are to be the qualities of the "Shoot", who in due
²
 time, is to grow up. Significantly the "Shoot" springing from
 David is unveiled as "such a Saviour as shall not see the goal
 of his calling in political ruling, but will be chiefly con-
³
 :cerned with the religious interests of God's Kingdom". The
 order here is priesthood then kingship, as is also the case in
 Psl.110 and Is.53. The growing emphasis upon the religious
 side of the Messianic vocation, which König among most other
 Old Testament scholars sees in Jewish Messianism, is we believe
 not so much a new development as it is the germination of ideas
 which formed the original content of the earliest Jewish
 Messianic ideal, namely, a priest after the order of Melchizedek.

Indeed so strong is the emphasis upon the priestly
 functions of the future Saviour by this post-exilic time, that
 Gressmann is of the opinion that the writer of the first half
 of Zechariah marks the point at which there was the first real
 division of the former Messianic ideal of a priest-kingly
 Messiah./

1. König: "Die Messianischen Weissagungen" (p.269) writes:
 "ist die wahrscheinlichste Annahme, dass Serubbabel, von
 dem zuerst die Vollendung des Tempelbaues erwartet wurde,
 als politisch verdächtig bald durch die Perser beseitigt
 wurde, und nun die Erwartung der Vollendung des Tempelbaues
 sich an den "Spross", den zu erwartenden Davididen knüpfte.
2. See Perowne in Cambridge Bible on Zech.6:11-13.
3. König: *ibid.*supra p.270

1

Messiah. He writes:

"Zechariah's idea is original. Till then there had been but one Messiah and the dignity of king and priest was united in one person".

But though this conclusion derives support from later prophecy in which the Temple is made the centre of the future theophany (Mal.3:1-5, 16)², so in Haggai (2:7-9) and Zechariah (9:9 ff), where the coming of Jehovah to His Temple is to usher in the Messianic blessings, it is not deducible from the first part of Zechariah.³ If the priesthood of the Messiah has any place in later prophecy it is definitely connected with the Aaronic priesthood. By Maccabaeen times the two expectations of a kingly and priestly Messiah are in juxtaposition. In First Zechariah there is the historical situation of the divided kingly office in the person of Zerrubabel and Joshua, but there is an obvious effort on the part of the writer to preserve the ancient ideal of the Messiah. The placing of the crowns upon the head of Joshua (ver.11), symbolic of the complete unity of the offices of priest and King in the "Shoot", and the word of explanation (6:13), "The counsel of peace shall be between them both", indicates the greater unity of the Messianic office which both temporal rulers are made to typify.⁴ The mention of the throne, in 6:13 the throne of the perfect David and thus the/

1. "Der Messias", p.264.

2. See Montfiore: "Hibbert Lectures", p.300.

3. In this part of Zechariah there is no prominence or even mention of the Aaronic priesthood as is the case in Ezekiel where priesthood is the most prominent feature of the time of consummation.

4. See König: "Die Messianischen Weissagungen", p.271.

Chapter VI

the throne of the kingship of Jehovah (2 Sam.7:13b and Psl.110:1), indicates that the writer has in mind the ideal Messiahship of the priest-king set forth in Psl.110:4. Dr Sharpe has indicated that the Septuagint version rendered the passage "and shall be priest on His right hand"¹. Clearly the LXX translators connected it with Psl.110, and we have every reason to believe, as König shows that such was the original intention of the writer, the union of both the kingly and priestly dignity in this representative of Jehovah.²

It is unnecessary to labour further the extent of influence which the priest-kingly ideal of the Davidic dynasty had upon the moulding of later prophetic Messianic ideas. Its relationship in particular to the Suffering Servant Song and the first part of Zechariah, are thought to be sufficient authorization for the contentions of this treatise. The opinion that the priesthood of Christ in the Epistle to the Hebrews is an isolated phenomenon, having little connection with the main stream of Jewish Messianism, is a myth. The central doctrine of the Epistle has its source not in an arbitrary selection of Psl.110:4, for it cannot be believed that it was by pure chance that the author lighted upon this passage, though likely ignorant of the part which its ideal had played in Jewish expectation of a Deliverer from Jehovah. And though the Epistle seems/

1. "Three Lectures With Notes", p.65.
2. Ibid.supra, p.271. Of the person to occupy the throne he writes: "Bloss der Spross, nur soll dieser Königliche und priesterliche Würde als Repräsentant Jahives besiffen".

seems to be an unconscious development of the ancient Davidic Messianic ideal, it is not unlikely that he owes the central significance, which he gives the priesthood of the Messiah, to the early traditions of the Christian Church.¹ Furthermore, it is apparent that it was not to satisfy the demands of a unique argument for the superiority of the priesthood of Christ that he sets aside the Levitical order. For the ancient priest-king regime had no place for an order which did not recognize the King as head of both spiritual and temporal affairs. However the author of "Hebrews" comes by this argument, it certainly is a legitimate one in view of the Jewish Messianic Ideal. The Church has good authority for such a claim: if its dogma is not derived from Christ himself then it rests securely upon the Jewish national ideal, of a returning perfect David who was both priest and king upon the throne of Jehovah. Our author stresses the priestly function of the Messiah in much the same way as it^{is} stressed in Ezekiel and Malachi, but as we have seen the office of King clings persistently to his exposition of the priesthood of Christ. The picture he conveys to the reader is the Priest-King upon the right hand of God's throne.

1. The point of discussion in the following chapter VIII.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

Though the essential Messianic content of Psalm 110, Isaiah 53 and Part 1 of the prophecy of Zechariah, was undoubtedly that of an ideal priest-king, it is by no means clear that this original meaning was understood by later Jewish interpreters. However, there is no doubt that the passages were Messianically interpreted. It is the opinion of most Jewish and Christian scholars to-day that both Isaiah 53¹ and Psalm 110 referred to the Messiah, but there is doubt as to whether Zechariah was so regarded.² There have been so many contradictory opinions expressed by those who presumably have a first hand knowledge of the Targums, that it would appear that appeal to the Targums on the matter is futile. In whatever way the contradictory evidence of the Targum, or its approximate silence, may be explained, the fact remains³ - and it is the more significant fact - /

1. Dalman: "Jesus-Jeshua"; gives abundance of evidence that Is.53 applied to the Messiah in many quarters as did the Targum on the prophets. See p.64 of Dalman.
2. Drummond: "The Jewish Messiah", claims that the priesthood of the Messiah is not deducible from the Targum on Zechariah, p.310. Dr.Sharpe is of the opinion that it is quoting Shottgen, Horae Hebr.11, pp.642-644, to that effect: see "Three Lectures with Notes", p.43.
3. Rabbi Schiller-Sczinessy has written: "to avoid the influence on the less learned of the scriptural controversy carried on by adversaries, whom they thought either ignorant or dishonest, or both, the Rabbis, not without considerable pain and misgiving, withdrew some of the most hallowed portions of scripture from the public reading of the synagogue. Quoted by Dr.Sharpe (ibid.supra p.60) He conjectures that the Targum was influenced by this same propaganda.

fact - that all three were claimed by the early Church as witnessing to Christ. Admittedly, in so many words, they do not appear to have estimated their Messianic meaning in terms of priest-kingship, but it would be just as unfair to say that they had missed altogether this original content. Ignorant as the first interpreters may have been of the ideal which lay at the root of all this prophecy, nevertheless the ultimate significance which they came to give their risen Lord was clearly the perfect fulfilment of the ancient Hebrew ideal. That this is the case, is shown by the extensive use made of these passages by New Testament writers. An examination of this use will indicate that there is considerable evidence that the mind of the early Church was occupied, to a degree, with the priesthood of Christ.

Prof. B. W. Bacon has expressed the opinion that the early Church was saturated with the idea of the efficacy of the intercession of the martyrs. And that it was familiar with the self-dedicating intercession of Moses for the sin of the people, and may well have harboured the belief apparent in 4th Maccabees of the immediate resurrection of all lives which were given in martyrdom and who were already standing before the throne of God. In view of this he writes:

"It would have been a marvel if in such an age the followers of the crucified had not connected His Ascension with the prophecy of the Suffering Servant, exalted and lifted up to be a priest for many nations".

The fact is that they did so regard Him, though apart from the/

1. "Jesus and Paul", p.112.

the Epistle to the Hebrews, He is not named priest. It is significant that Is.52:12-53: is so frequently quoted or referred to in the New Testament. Among these may be singled out such instances as the following: Its use by the Baptist on seeing Jesus (John 1:29), "Behold the Lamb of God"; by Matthew (8:17), "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses"; by Jesus on His death (Lk.22:37), "and He was reckoned among the transgressors". It formed the scriptural reading of the Ethiopian eunuch and was explained by Philip, of Christ (Acts 8:32-34). It was quoted by Paul as "Christ our passover" (1 Cor. 5:7). In the Book of Revelation (5:6,12; 13:8) Christ is "The Lamb slain"; and in (1 Pet.2:21-25), "Christ our example and sacrifice". Furthermore, it is to be noticed in this last passage that the writer following the LXX rendering of Is.53: , "in His own body bare our sins upon the tree", employs the usual expression for a priestly offering (cf. 1 Pet.2:21 and Lev.14:20).

With the exception of the passage from Peter these passages indicate little more than that Isaiah 53 was used merely to point to Christ as the sacrifice. But the office of Sacrificer is also attributed to Christ. Clearly Christ is regarded as the Sacrificer in John 10:17,18. Again in those passages where the voluntariness of His death is dwelt upon "Not as I will but as Thou wilt". Gayford on this point, claims that "all passages describing His death as actively the result of His own will, reveal Him as Sacrificer, and those in which His passive self-surrender is shown reveal Him as Victim".¹ /

1. "Sacrifice and Priesthood", p. 43.

Victim'. That this voluntary laying down of His life was thought of in terms of the Levitical sacrifices was the conclusion reached in a previous discussion (p.99). In view of this, such a statement as that in John's Gospel (10:17,18) where Jesus is the Sacrificer, is a significant index of the persistence of this view of His death.

Besides these direct references to Is.53, which imply a priestly and sacrificial significance to the death of Christ, there are other passages which hint at the doctrine of Christ's priesthood being under discussion from the first days of the Church. From the very first the disciples seem to have seen that Jesus fulfilled the predictions of the Servant of Jahweh.¹ And, though no emphasis is placed on the Suffering Servant passage in the first chapter of Acts, and direct reference to it is not made in Stephen's speech,² this speech must have given rise to thoughts of the Song in which the Servant's death took away sin, apart from the Levitical system of sacrificial atonement. The charges against Stephen were: "This man ceaseth not to speak against this Holy place and the Law. For we have heard him say that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy this place and charge the customs Moses delivered unto us". Sacrifice was the most striking of these acts of worship at the Temple. In Daniel's propheisied that after Messiah's death, sacrifice would cease (9:26,27), and Jesus is credited with having said: "I/

1. B.W.Bacon: "Mark" finds the Servant of Isaiah ideal to be the dominant thought concerning the person of Christ in the Q and L source as in the first chapters of Acts. p.223.
2. Neither is direct reference made to it in "Hebrews", strangely enough.

Chapter Vlll

"I came not to destroy the Law and the prophets but to fulfil". He had fulfilled the type of the victim to which the Church has abundantly testified, and the thought of fulfilling the type of the priest must not have been absent either. Stephen by this speech must have aroused the discussion of the priesthood of Christ. It would be of a psychological necessity that Jewish Christians should inquire in virtue of Stephen's argument, wherein Christ fulfilled the ceremonial acts, apart from which, they could not, as Jews, conceive of the expiation of sins. The natural and seemingly inevitable conclusion of a Jewish Christian would be that He had performed both the part of the Victim and the Priest.¹

But, apart from the possibility that such might be the trend of Jewish Christian reflection on Stephen's speech, the violent Jewish reaction is significant. Stephen's speech was a deadly thrust at the heart of Jewish piety and exclusiveness, the Mosaic Law revealed by God at Sinai. They could not allow aspersion to be cast at anything so sacred. They could not dream of that Law, which centred in the ceremonial observances of the Temple, being changed or set aside by any other act - particularly that of the prophet of Nazareth, was anathema. It was for this reason and because of some such claim as is echoed by Stephen, that they had brought Jesus to His death.² We have reason to believe that such/

1. For further discussion of the teaching of Stephen and the Seven, see p.195f. of this treatise.
2. The matter will receive fuller discussion when we come to consider the Jerusalem ministry and the nature of the accusation upon which Jesus was condemned.

such continued to be the main objection which the Jews had to Christianity. It will account for the relentless hatred which inspired their earliest persecutions of the Church, as nothing else will.

Much of our knowledge of early Christianity we owe to Paul, but it was to the Gentile world that Paul turned his energies. Consequently, he had no occasion to labour this fulfilment of the sacrificial system in Christ.¹ The appeal he made to the Gentiles on the Cross of Christ was largely upon other grounds than those upon which appeal would have been made to Jews. But the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, makes his appeal from what happened outside the Camp, from the point of its fulfilment and transcendence of the old system of taking away sin. Still even in Paul we have echoes of this essentially Jewish aspect of the death of Christ. It is possible that there is an exact parallel to the thought of Christ as priest and sacrificer in Ephesians (5:2).² Again Paul employs the Levitical terms for sacrificial expiation (Rom.3:25 cf. Heb.2:17,18), ~~also of~~ John 2:2, 4:10), Paul's ascription of a saving efficacy to the blood of the Cross of Christ points to an element in his teaching where the death of Christ is a fulfilment of the sacrificial system. Warfield³ claims/

1. H.B.Swete remarking on this absence of reference to Christ as priest in Paul, writes: "It is possible that He was kept from developing His soteriology in this direction by the danger of misapprehension on the part of his Gentile readers to whom sacrificial and hierarchical terms might have conveyed impressions reflected from their heathen surroundings". (The Ascended Christ", p.36, McMillan 1911).
2. See J.K.Mozely: "Doctrine of the Atonement", 1916, p.82.
3. Article in Princeton Theol.Review, July 1917, "Christ our Sacrifice".

claims that his thought clearly points to the forms of the altar, (Rom.5:9; 1 Cor.10:16; Eph.1:7, 2:13; Col.1:20). Apart from these references Paul does not interpret the work of Christ in sacrificial terms.¹ The very fact that he makes such a limited use of this sacrificial language suggests that he was endeavouring to avoid their use, not that they were not germane to the thought of the death of Christ, but that they gave further occasion of offence to the Jews and might lead to misrepresentation and extravagance among Gentiles. His use of them at all would seem to indicate that they were part of that early Christian tradition which he had received as he did, "how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures".² Further Paul makes a great deal of the intercession of Christ, which lends additional support to the above conclusions. Since this may more properly come under the discussion of the use of the 110th Psalm, we will turn our attention to it now.

Psalm 110.

Psalm 110, one of the most frequently quoted passages of scripture by New Testament Writers. Whatever the original purpose its quotation served, it was later given a variety of use. Apart from Jesus' use of it in answer to the question of Messiahship which presents one of our chief problems, there is/

1. See A.E.J.Rawlinson in "Foundations", 1912, p.193, where he objects to Eph.5:2 being taken to connote a sacrificial view of Christ's death on the grounds that it is not a sin-offering but a burnt offering. He agrees that the other passages may be so regarded.
2. 1. Cor.15:3.

is His use of it again during the trial, when questioned by the high priest on the same issue, His Messiahship (Mt.26:64). Its next recorded use is in Acts (2:32-36) where Peter employs it to prove that Jesus has been raised to the right hand of God and made Lord of salvation. A resurrection proof text appears to have been its first use by the Apostles. This was largely the Pauline use too, (Col.3:1), but he has other uses besides. In the first place, it is from it that he derives his thought of the intercession of Christ (Rom.8:34). Then he has still another use which corresponds with its use in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Sovereignty of Christ (1 Cor.15:25). This office of Intercessor and King, Paul apparently derives entirely from Ps.110:1, and makes no mention whatever of verse 4. The office of Intercessor, Paul seems to have made fundamental to his interpretation of Christianity.¹ Swete asserts that for Paul "not the Cross and the Passion but the Ascension and the high-priestly intercession are the climax of our Lord's saving work".² Seemingly Christ's Heavenly ministry is in everything but name that of the great High Priest, who reconciles (2 Cor.5:18-20; Gal.4:4) and intercedes for men (Rom.8:34 cf. Heb.7:24).

Contiguous to this Pauline development of Ps.110:1 is the description of Christ as Advocate (1 John 2:1). Furthermore, the Apocalypse of John represents believers as made by Christ, kings and priests of God (1:6, 5:10, 20:6). In as much/

1. See Bacon "The Apostolic Message", p.56.

2. H.B.Swete "The Ascended Christ", 1911, p.50.

much as Christ's kingship is prior to that of believers, indeed the source of that of believers, it is likely that on the same principle the writer has derived his conception of the priesthood of believers from that of the priesthood of Christ. A much similar representation as this is found in 1. Peter 2:5, "Christians are an holy priesthood....". In both these writings the believers hold their office of priesthood jointly with Christ, whereas in our Epistle the priesthood is quite unique and incommunicable; still there may be something of this same idea contained in Heb.13:15, "through Him then let us offer up the sacrifice of praise continually.....".

Clearly there is nothing in the other New Testament writers' use of Psalm 110 that can be said to be exactly analagous to the use made of it by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Nothing except the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, and this, he has apparently derived not from 110:1 but 110:4 to which the others make no allusion. It is hard to account for this omission on the part of the others in view of the proximity and unity of the verses. The omission seems almost intentional, but there is no discoverable motive for thinking it to be such. But, after all, it is not so clear that this difference between the origin of the idea in "Hebrews" and the other writings, is real. Can it be said that our author has gotten his conception of the priesthood solely from verse 4? The fact is that he merely uses the 4th verse to explain that doctrine of Christ's priesthood which is already the common traditional/

traditional belief of the Christianity of his time. His first mention of the doctrine says nothing about its being after the order of Melchizedek (2:17), "a merciful and faithful high priest in the things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people". In writing that, had he expressed anything more than Paul or the writer of the Johannine Epistles? All have in common something which approaches to a doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. And the question with regard to the doctrine, as stated in the Epistle "Hebrews", is not one of the legitimacy of the whole idea of the doctrine, but is the author's additional characterization of the priesthood as "after the order of Melchizedek" a legitimate one? It is, we have seen, perfectly in accord with the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal, expressed in the Psalm. Whether the author of "Hebrews" was aware of this agreement may be doubted, but that he comes by his interpretation of the Psalm by chance, is equally unbelievable. There is still to be considered Jesus' use of the Psalm, which, it is believed, offers an explanation of our author's use and is probably the indirect authority for the development given in the 4th verse of the Psalm in "Hebrews".

The Synoptic evangelists all agree in reporting Jesus' use of Ps1.110, during His Jerusalem ministry, (Mk.12:35; Matt.22:42 ff., Lk.20:41 ff.).¹ Mark is accused of reporting/

1. Prof. Bacon, apparently for no other reason than the Pauline use of the same Psalm, questions the authenticity of its use here with the Temple debates and^{holds} that it is employed as a mere anticipation of the proof texts of the resurrection. He is pretty much alone though in thus discarding it. "Jesus and Paul", p.149.

reporting the incident in opposition to a Son of David Christology, but Matthew and Luke are unaware that such is Mark's intention. And, though the argument may suggest later apostolic influence towards directing attention to the unique dignity of Christ, which later characterized their thought of the Risen Christ at the right hand of God, there is no reason to doubt that Jesus disparaged the popular idea of a political deliverer.¹ The fact is that Jesus assures His questioners that the Messianic office is too great a thing, either to be conceived politically, or what is more, it is too great to be made a matter of pedigree. Without assuming that Jesus quoted any more than the first verse of the Psalm, this seems to offer the most plausible conclusion as to Jesus' intention. And as Bacon asserts, it is exactly upon this point that the author of "Hebrews" fixes. He writes:

"Our author in thus characterizing the Melchizedekian priesthood is simply following the example of Jesus in the matter of the Davidic monarchy. Neither His kingly or priestly office comes to Him by descent, but by divine appointment, "for no man taketh the honour unto himself".²

If there is still objection to this conclusion on the grounds that Jesus is not reported ~~to have~~ used verse 4 and that there is a singular ~~silence~~ in later writers of crediting Him with this use - even our Epistle never refers to the incident - it is held that the objection is invalidated by the actual course of the Jerusalem ministry. In anticipation of this study to be made in the following chapter, there is the significant/

1. See W. Manson: ("Moffatt Commentary on Luke", p.227).
2. Expos. Times XIII p.346, article "The Priesthood without Pedigree".

significant second quotation of Psl.110:1 recorded by Matthew (26:64). It is surely not without significance for the understanding of the Messianic role Jesus was engaged in, that this Psalm, depicting the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal, appears to have been so much in the mind of our Lord during those last days.

There remains to be examined the problem of the extent of influence, if any, which the Messianic prophecies of Zechariah have had upon the mind of Jesus, or upon the New Testament presentation of His person and work. It is first to be noted that Zechariah, like Psl.110 and Isaiah 53, is one of the most frequently quoted of Old Testament prophecies. It is sometimes suggested that the first Christian evangelists would naturally be most interested in those books which contained the name of Jesus and even that Jesus Himself would ponder most such parts of the scripture. Whether this was the case or not, both the mind of our Lord and that of the Christians of the first century seem to have been greatly exercised with this Jewish writing.

In the study of the relationship of our Epistle to the Synoptic Gospels, it was shown that there was embedded in the Transfiguration account, a tradition which apparently thought of Jesus as the archetype of Joshua the high priest (Zech.3). There is still another passage Lk.21:36, "that ye may prevail to escape.....and stand before the Son of Man", in which both the theme and language used have a close parallel in this same chapter of Zechariah (3:3,7). While Luke uses the aorist $\sigma\tau\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ Zechariah has the perfect $\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$. Where in/

Chapter VIII

in Zechariah "to stand before the face of" is rendered by the use of $\pi\rho\acute{o}\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\omega}\ \tau\iota\omicron\upsilon$. Luke expresses it more briefly by $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\mu\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon$. This is just the passage where Ἰησοῦς is the great priest, to whom it is said, "If thou wilt walk in my ways I will give thee some of them which stand here". Selwyn suggests that the parallel was actually in the mind of Jesus and that both here, and in the case of the Transfiguration incident, Jesus was deliberately fulfilling Zechariah.¹

There are indeed other elements which, when taken into consideration, make it not improbable that the prophecy of Zechariah was much in the mind of Jesus. For we have to reckon with the fact of His anointing at Bethany, and particularly the studied fulfilment of Zechariah 9:9 in the Gospel accounts of the Entry into Jerusalem. If the prophecy of Zechariah was in the mind of our Lord, as certainly the evangelists present it as being on the occasion of His entrance to the City, it is difficult to understand that other passages of the same were not also in His mind. The evangelists testify that He sprang from the family of David (Zech.12:8); the Messiah combines in His own person the offices of high priest and king (Zech.6:9-15); as high priest He expiates in one day the sin of the whole land (Zech.3:9 cf. Heb.9:12 and Acts 10:43) and provides an open fountain from sin and uncleanness (13:1), by means of His death and the shedding of His blood (12:10). These points of contact between the records of the life of Jesus and Zechariah, together/

1. "New Testament Oracles", p.341.

together with the close correspondence of the early Church doctrine of the efficacy of His death, with the words of Zechariah on the sacrificial character of Messiah's death, must be borne in mind when considering the probability of the doctrine of the priesthood of Christ, existing in the early Apostolic Church.

To summarize the results of these three studies, it must be acknowledged that there is singularly little evidence that any New Testament writer was fully cognizant of the ideal Messianic content of the passages so frequently used. No matter how closely they approximated to regarding Christ in this priest-kingly character, nowhere do they explicitly do so. The reasons for the absence in Paul's Epistles may, as was conjectured above, have been intentional. Again, it must be borne in mind that the Epistles were called forth by special needs. They were written to Gentiles unfamiliar with the Jewish office of high priest and priest-kingship. However, it may be truly enough said, that the Apostolic Church thought of their Risen Lord as a King on the Heavenly throne and, at the same time, as a Priest before the throne, having offered up a sacrifice of His own life, now made intercession for them.

CHAPTER LX

THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS IN THE
LIGHT OF HIS JERUSALEM MINISTRY.

The determination of the exact nature and sequence of events in the Jerusalem Ministry of Jesus, has presented a problem that amounts almost to a dilemma for students of the Gospels. The evangelists' accounts all seem written with a dogmatic interest. But within their accounts are details of a tradition which are not dominated by this dogma. In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus' departure for Jerusalem (10:33) shows Him deliberately leaving Galilee with the express purpose of being delivered up to death. But 3:6; 6:14-16, point to totally different reasons for His departure from Galilee. The hostility of Herod must have had something to do with His retreat from Galilee. There is a further trace of this hostility in 8:15 and ^{1k}13:31, "Get thee out and depart from thence for Herod will kill thee". (The existence of two distinct traditions present in

The existence of certain contradictory material within the evangelists' accounts makes a reconstruction of the Jerusalem ministry almost a hopeless task. But there are certain elements which, it is believed, deserve special attention in /

in estimating the role which Jesus adopted during the closing period of His ministry. It is our purpose, in the limited scope of the present chapter, to investigate those to the end that they may throw some light upon the main doctrinal position of the Epistle to the Hebrews. No matter how fantastic the project may appear at first sight, the facts adducible merit serious consideration.

John the Baptist.

There is a growing opinion on the part of many scholars that the ministry of Jesus is in some way vitally connected with that of John the Baptist¹ - this to a greater and different extent than the Gospels indicate. "Q" the earliest known Christian document is thought² to have begun with an account of John the Baptist. The view, that the relative importance of John's ministry has been misrepresented by the evangelists, has found support in recent years, on the one hand, from the study of the Mandaean literature, and, on the other hand, by the claims which Eisler has advanced for the authenticity of the Halosis (Russian version of Josephus)³. But the Mandaean documents, with the exception of the Book of John and one passage in the Genza, make no mention of the life and teaching of John the Baptist⁴. The whole origin, and even text of these writings, is far too uncertain as yet to be made the basis of/

1. See Blakiston: "John Baptist and His Relation to Jesus", (London 1912). This book is a valuable contribution to an understanding of the relation of Jesus' ministry to that of John.
2. See "Studies in Early Christianity" (edited by S.J. Case, 1928, article by C.R. Bowen "A New Study of John Baptist").
3. Robert Eisler "The Messiah Jesus and John The Baptist" 1931.
4. See Schonfield "The Lost Book of the Nativity of John". The reader is also referred to an article by Mead, "The Quest", XVlll, pp.80-92 (1926).

of proof that the evangelists entirely misrepresented John and that the Fourth Gospel's opening chapter is an excerpt from the "Book of the Nativity of John", with the substitution of the name of Jesus for that of John.¹

Easton thinks that the verbal contacts with the Fourth Gospel are due not to borrowing but to the use of a common source. This conjectured common source must have emphasized the prominence of John, otherwise it is difficult to explain the Mandaean adoption of John rather than Jesus, as their founder. The results of Dr. Reizenstein's researches into the practice of Christian Baptism, point to their source in Mandaeism. And though these results have not had general acceptance, ^{this conjectured common source} ~~this~~ may prove to be a more likely source than either Gnosticism or the Mystery religions. The common source may also have contained rites of Baptism, the practice of which owed its origin to Persian influences. But, as yet, we cannot rely on any such sources for our knowledge of the Baptist.

We may set aside as untenable the extravagant claims made for the influence of Mandaeism upon Christianity and Christian writings, but still the Gospels themselves contain evidence both of the importance of the Baptist movement and the evident respect in which John was held by Jesus. The movement of John continued to flourish in Alexandria (Acts 18:24). John seems to have been/

1. See F.C.Burkitt "Church and Gnosis" (Morse Lectures 1932, ch.IV) refers to a document of the 8th Century which traces their origin to the Manichaeans and Marcionites. According to Hölgenfeldt and Wellhausen they were originally a Jewish or Judaeian Christian sect. But Brandt, (E.R.E.vol.viii article on same) shows this at variance with many facts.

been actually regarded as the Messiah (John 5:35). Further Jesus was thought by Herod to be John Redivivus, (Mk.6:16). And though the Fourth Gospel does not say that Jesus was baptized at the hands of John, the Synoptics¹ do. The submission of Jesus to the rite of John can mean nothing but His adherence to that movement. Mk.1:4, Mt.4:12,17 imply that John's activities ceased when Jesus appeared on the scene, but the evangelists' accounts do not bear this out, for later John sends his disciples to inquire of Jesus whether he is the Messiah (Mt.11:2-6; Lk.7:19). In spite of the confusing nature of the Gospels' evidence the initial identity of Jesus' movement with that of the Baptist is apparent, as is also the fact of their separation. But the implication of the Gospels is that they early became separated on the grounds, first, that John was but the utterer of a given message concerning Jesus and was content to give place to Him, and, secondly, Jesus is represented as proclaiming a different message and He and His disciples carrying on a mission with greater results (John 3:26).

However, the Gospels contain a certain amount of evidence that the two movements were really one movement under two leaders up until the time of John's death. This is certainly the implication in Mt.14:12,13, "and his disciples (John Baptist's) came and took up the body and buried it, and went and told Jesus. When Jesus heard it,/"

1. C.R.Bowen in the article above, claims on good grounds that Baptism as practised by John did not entail immersion at his hands, but that the subject performed the rite himself while John merely pronounced the incantation from the bank.

it, He departed thence by ship into a desert place apart..
...". The anxiety of John's disciples for the safety of
Jesus and Jesus' immediate retiral, points to the identity
of the one movement with the other throughout the whole
period of John.Baptist's life.¹ But apart from this
Matthaeian account and the accounts of the Baptism of Jesus
by John, Jesus is nowhere else identified by the evangelists
with the mission of John. On the one hand, they are
depicted as two distinct religious movements, on the other,
John is but the herald of Jesus.

These contradictory elements, in the Gospel accounts,
point to two conclusions, deducible from the evangelists'
handling of the tradition relating to the Baptist and Jesus.
(1) Their representation of Jesus as fulfilling John
Baptist's message is probably due to a tradition which
identified Jesus with the Baptist movement from the beginn-
:ing as is indicated in the Baptism accounts; and also to
an equally well known tradition which represented Jesus as
taking up the uncompleted work of the Baptist. (2) Their
attempt to distinguish Jesus' Mission from that of the
Baptist by representing them as separate movements from an
early period in Jesus' Galilean ministry is most likely due
to the continuance of a Baptist sect distinct from the
Christian group. Obviously the Church would be greatly
disturbed by its persistence in the face of their preaching
of John as the herald of Jesus.

The impression given by the synoptic evangelists is
that a schism occurred during

1. Herod had sufficient reasons for identifying Jesus
with John risen from the dead.

Chapter LX

the life time of the Baptist, whereas it must have only occurred at the time Jesus took up the work of His great predecessor.¹ If there is a difference in their teaching, it was a difference accentuated by the personality and religious insight of One who brought to perfection the ideas of the great reformer - and added to them. Goguel claims that the separation was due to Jesus' recognition that repentance as proclaimed by John was not enough, it was still to have a place in His gospel but He added to it the pardon God wishes to give.² This is true enough, but there is no evidence that Jesus found fault with any of the teaching of John. The only occasion which points to a time when Jesus would have reflected upon the value of John's message was the apparent failure of the mission at the death of John. This provided the opportunity for the religious genius of Jesus. The existence of a separatist movement, which claimed John as founder, is evidence that all the disciples of John did not acquiesce in Jesus' claim to succeed their former master. They continued under the name of the Baptist. That some of them later changed their minds as to the right of Jesus to the succession of their master is shown in Acts 18:24.

Bacon and others recognize that Jesus took up the work of John, but they have done so without taking into account/

1. Prof.K.Lake (Expos.Nov.1912) places^{the} Baptist's death in 34-35 and the Crucifixion in 36. The consensus of opinion is that^{the} Baptist's death occurred at least a year prior to the Crucifixion.
2. Harvard "Theol. Review" April 1930, article by M.Goguel.

account the implied separatist movement prior to John's death.¹ To hold at all that Jesus took up the work of the Baptist, puts out of the question any separate movement before the death of John. The Gospels witness to a distinct Baptist movement, which evidence cannot be ignored. It can be accounted for only on the grounds stated above: it was comprised of those who dissented from the leadership of Jesus. Consequently, it can truly enough be affirmed that Jesus took up the uncompleted task of the Baptist. His was a greater message than that of John's, but it was the Baptist's preaching^{that} gave the impulse to His first public appearance, and he never openly distinguishes His mission from that of the Baptist. Jesus' reverence for John and His answer to the delegation from the priests who came to Him while He taught in the Temple (Mk.11:27-33), indicate that Jesus' conception of His mission was the fulfilment of John's.²

What then was the character of John's mission? The evangelists only use for John is to show Him the herald of the Kingdom and the Christ. However, the material which they used indicate other facts about the Baptist, which, when considered together with the testimony of Josephus (Antiq.xviii.2), "Antipas fearing lest the extent to which he had gained the confidence of the people might lead to/

1. B.W.Bacon, "Journal of Biblical Literature", vol.xlviii, 1929 p.40-81. Also Blackiston referred to above and Cadman, who thinks that it was only on the point of going to Jerusalem that Jesus abandoned the repentance movement of the Baptist. ("Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem", 1923, p.102.
2. See "The Apostolic Message", Bacon, p.240.

to open rebellion.....thought it much better to anticipate any mischief he might cause by putting him to death", point to something of the greater importance in the Baptist movement. It bore certain marks of being of a dangerous and revolutionary character, sufficient to promote misapprehension, so John was put to death. According to the Gospels it was John's condemnation of Herod's immorality which brought about his death. The evangelists themselves do not seem very certain of the exact historical circumstances attending the death of John. This confusion in their accounts lends support to the opinion that there were other and deeper underlying causes for Herod's order of execution than the whim of a dancing girl. John's mission must have borne the marks of being of a political nature, to have thus aroused Herod. Just what that political character was, there has been left singularly little trace of in the gospels. And that it was of the ordinary insurrectionist type is out of the question. Neither in the gospels nor Josephus is John classed among those who took up arms against Rome.

About the only hint we have, as to the nature of John's mission, apart from the gospels, is that given in Josephus (Ant.xviii.5:2), where he describes John The Baptist's teaching after the manner of Malachi. John as the youngest of the sons of Levi was trained by his father Zacharias to fulfil the words of Malachi. (Mal.3:3) "he shall purify the sons of Levi". It is Mal.3, which is in the Baptist's mind, and many of its words are upon his lips when/

when he preaches by the Jordan (Lk.3:12-18). Consequently it is little wonder that the priests and Levites, according to the Fourth Gospel, come to John the Baptist (Jn.1:19) asking him "Who art thou?" John's mission to the Levites and the fact that Jesus took up John's work, may have considerable to do with the incident recorded (Acts6:7), "A great multitude of the priests were obedient to the faith".

1

Bacon writes:

"John had come of a priestly stock. He had been the embodiment of all the prophetic ideals of Malachi, in which a purified Temple centre of worship for a redeemed humanity is the cardinal principle".

Again there are evidences that John was regarded as the Messiah. Luke relates that John's reason for heralding the Coming One, was the growth of the idea among the people that he might be the Messiah (3:15,16). John 5:35 implies that John was regarded as Messiah: "He was a burning and a shining light and ye were willing to rejoice in his light for a season". These Messianic claims, or at least the Messianic hopes which the people centred in John, must have been of such a nature as would excite the jealousy and suspicion of Herod. Herod Antipas must have inherited some of the secret fears of Herod the Great, regarding the revival of the Asmonaeon dynasty. John was of the House of Levi; if Messiahship was attributed to him, it would inevitably be that associated with the names of the Macabaeon priest-kings as in the Testament of the XII

Patriarchs./

1. "Jesus the Son of God" (Kent Schaffer Memorial Lecture, Yale 1930, p.61).

Patriarchs. It is believed that these facts, taken by themselves, are sufficient justification for claiming that the Messianic hopes, associated with the Baptist, and which led to his execution, were none other than those of a priest after the order of Melchizedek. However, it is necessary to consider also those claims of Eisler which substantiate this view.

Eisler regards the Markan story of the Baptism of Jesus, as being based upon the Nazoraean text, and that the reference to Jesus is an interpolated one. He refers to the Testament of Levi 18, where it is foretold that over the High-priest of the last days, who is compared to a king, "the Heavens shall open and from the Temple of glory shall sanctification come upon him with the Father's voice".¹ Eisler thinks this can have no other reference than to John the Baptist and his election by the people as high-priest after the order of Melchizedek. But his whole argument largely rests upon the rather uncertain evidence of the Nazoraean source, which as we have seen above, cannot claim to be an early document. However, there is this much truth in Eisler's claims, that the source from which both the Gospel account and the Nazoraean account are derived, form a tradition of the Baptism which possibly ascribed, either to John or to Jesus, or to both, the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecy of the Testament of Levi. But there is nothing which amounts to proof on the matter.

There is a further reference in Josephus which does point/

1. Ibid. supra pp. 260 ff.

point to the extreme probability that some such claim was made by the Baptist, or was made concerning him. In the Wars 11:3-8, the Jews claimed the right to elect another high-priest in the place of Jo'asar B.Boethus, "a man of greater piety and purer morals". This claim, Josephus says, the Jews never abandoned and was carried into execution by John of Gishalla (ibid.lv.3,8)¹. Indeed it is not unlikely, in view of the ^{popular} esteem which the Gospels depict John enjoying by the people, that they cherished just such an ambition with regard to John. But there is nothing to indicate that it was actually carried out as Eisler suggests.² Still there is reason to believe that the execution of the Baptist was really occasioned by his association with the Messianic claims of the Asmonaeon priest-kings.

THE JERUSALEM MINISTRY

When due weight is given^{to} these plans for national reform, which the Baptist held, and^{to} the Messianic hopes with which he must have been identified, the Jerusalem Ministry of Jesus may no longer be an enigma defying solution. The Messianic secret may become less of a secret and the atmosphere of mystery that envelopes the Gospel accounts of those last days of our Lord, may be considerably dispelled. B.W. Bacon made a statement with regard to the nature of Jesus' ministry that has more truth in it than he was apparently aware of at the time. At least he made no effort to justify it./

1. See Ant. xviii, 4.3; xv.2,4. The Romans kept the high-priest's royal robe under lock and key to prevent any such thing occurring.

2. See Ibid. supra p.259.

it. And though Bacon regarded Jesus as having taken up the work of the Baptist, he did not indicate the vital relationship which must actually have existed between the role of the Baptist and this role he fancied Jesus to have followed. He wrote of our Lord's words of consecration at the Supper:¹

"The work of the national leader had also failed. It marks a new stage in the ministry on a new and higher level. It is the utterance of a dedicated priest and intercessor. The last office which Jesus' loyalty to the cause of the Kingdom compels Him to take, is one that no man taketh upon himself but when he is called of God. It was an unforeseen consequence of the attempt to take the Temple out of the control of a corrupt and unworthy priesthood, and make it again His Father's House..... Though the very agony of defeat Jesus Himself was made an high-priest forever after the order of Melchizedek".

One is led to inquire whether the Jerusalem ministry, as a whole, lends any support to such a claim. But in order to avoid giving too much credence to the theory that Jesus carried to its conclusion the mission begun by John - which would necessarily influence the interpretation of the Jerusalem ministry - the Gospel accounts of that ministry must as far as is possible be studied for their own evidence as to what actually took place. In the first place, what was the real purpose behind Jesus' resolve to go up to Jerusalem?²/

1. "Jesus and Paul", p.50.
2. "The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge", F.C.Burkitt,(p.233) writes: "It seems to me, He most probably regarded His journey and the kind of action He took at Jerusalem, as in the nature of what in military affairs is called a 'forlorn hope' an attack with an off-chance of success". But such an attitude could scarcely be attributed to a Christian general, much less to Jesus, whose life was lived in the faith that God was guiding Him.

Jerusalem² Those who follow Schweitzer, in seeing Jesus the victim of a vain apocalyptic illusion, have accounted¹ for the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus. But in no matter what form ~~xxx~~ apocalypticism is ascribed to Jesus, it gives a forced and highly unnatural interpretation² of the events of His final ministry. Nor, again, will the opinion that He went to Jerusalem under the pressure of a popular Messianism, satisfy the evangelists' accounts. Moreover, His ministry there represents something more than a mere call to repentance of individuals and a concentrating of His effort upon a type of personal evangelism. An examination of all these indicates not only the unsatisfactoriness of holding any one of the customary solutions as final, but points to the likelihood that the characterization of Jesus as "A Priest after the order of Melchizedek", may, after all, prove to have more to do with a genuine tradition than hitherto has been granted.

The Messianic Entry

We can be certain of this that, when Jesus set out for the Capital, it was not in response to the popular demand for a political deliverer. From the incident of the feeding of the multitude it is plain that He cherished no ambition to become the leader of a movement to restore Israel/

1. See Cadman: "Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem", pp.99,
100.
2. See Pfleiderer: "Primitive Christianity", vol.11.p.34.
"Standing as he does at an extreme from the more recent apocalyptic school of interpretation, his studies are still among the most convincing arguments against extreme apocalyptic interpretation. He writes: "Jesus' journeyed thither not in order to die but to fight and to conquer".

Israel to its former independence. Goguel writes: "For Jesus such a Kingdom would always be only the persistence of the ancient economy which He judged bad and condemned, because the relations of men would continue to be regulated by violence¹". The exact character of the Messianic role, which at least from the time of the Confession of Peter at Philippi, He was conscious of acting, is far from clear from either that incident or from the Messianic Entry. As to the latter event, doubts have been entertained both as to its importance² and as to its being a Messianic Entry.³ The evangelists may have been tempted to exaggerate the event, but the details clearly point to its being the record of a genuine event, which could not well have been worked up ex eventu. Nor can its essential Messianic character be explained away on the grounds that the shouts of the people⁴ only indicated that He was the Herald of the Kingdom. The other details do not accord with such a version of the matter. As/

1. "La Vie de Jésus", p.405.

2. Ibid. (pp.394,395) "It appears that those who acclaimed Jesus were those who accompanied Him from Galilee. This is implied in Luke who makes the Pharisees say to Jesus: "rebuke thy disciples". Goguel thinks that had the entry been otherwise, Jesus would have been at once arrested. Matthew may indeed have accentuated the importance of the event when he stated that it put the whole city in an uproar, but the evidence drawn from the Lukan saying is after all an insignificant detail to base such a conclusion upon. The city was in its usual festival hubbub, and a large attendance upon Jesus would not only insure His safety at the time, but might cause little anxiety during days when vast Pilgrim bands arrived in triumph in the Holy City.

3. See Cadman: *ibid.* supra p.114.

4. Cadman: *ibid.* p.114.

As Goguel remarks: "it is not only the Messianic Kingdom¹ but the Messianic King who is acclaimed". The real problem is to decide, in view of all the richness of details with which the evangelists describe His dramatic entry, what was the popular Messianic title ascribed to Jesus on the occasion and whether he shared it?

It seems clear that whatever was the personnel of the group who hailed Jesus on His entry, they do not share the conventionally popular Messianic hopes. We may be sure of this that, whatever the prophetic symbolism of Zechariah meant to the mind of Jesus, certain members of the group who took part in the demonstration, if not all, must have entered into its real meaning.² Otherwise, it is difficult to explain their taking part. It is by no means certain that the popular Messianism of the time was confined to the notion of a national Deliverer and Son of David. Jesus had previously repudiated that notion, and it is unlikely that those, who followed Him from Galilee on this occasion, had forgotten that the Messianic conception, with which He had replaced an uncongenial one, was still fresh in their minds./

1. "La Vie de Jésus", p.393.
2. Many, of course, see in this His rejection of any Messianic claim and that He later repudiated in the Temple the conception of the Messiah which had given rise to the demonstration. The variety of interpretations are fully discussed by T.Walker: "Jesus and Jewish Teaching", pp.155 ff.(London, 1923). The evangelist John presents the ovation made to Jesus as entirely spontaneous and in saying that the meaning had only been recognized afterwards, appears to have transformed the tradition to suit his idea that Jesus returned to Jerusalem at Easter only for the purpose of dying, not to engage in work (Jn.12:16).

minds. This act of His was the expression of it, as were His subsequent actions in Jerusalem. In some form, the exact nature of which has been dropped or lost from the tradition, He is hailed as the Messiah. When His opponents pointed out the danger of this, He is said to have replied: "If these should be quiet the very stones would cry out¹ (Lk.19:40). Pfleiderer writes:

"All that we can clearly recognize is that Messianic ideas strongly influenced His mind during the last days at Jerusalem and form the pre-supposition upon which we have to understand His speech and action: the cleansing of the Temple, the parable of the wicked husbandmen and the other discourses directed against the hierarchy, the controversies regarding the tribute money and the Son of David, the promises and exhortations addressed to the disciples and not least the anointing at Bethany".

(His inattention when greeted by Bartimaeus may indicate His annoyance that at such an inopportune time this rejected title should be ascribed to Him.) The pacific character of the symbolism and the hymn sung (Ps.cxviii:26) suggest nothing of the martial hero of nationalistic expectation, and is poles apart from any current apocalyptic conception of the bringing in of the Kingdom of God. There is only one figure in the whole of Jewish Messianism which approximates to the symbolism and atmosphere of the accounts of the Triumphal Entry: the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal of a priest-king after the order of Melchizedek. As in the case of the ancient King of Salem (Prince of Peace), the picture, the evangelists have given us, is that of a Prince of/

1. "Primitive Christianity", p.438. vol.ii.

¹
of Peace.

The quotation from Pfleiderer above, was given at length because it indicates that whatever Messianic role Jesus was following, it must have influenced all His sayings and actions while in Jerusalem; and it is in the light of a definite Messianic claim which He made, or indicated, either before or at the time of the Entry, that we shall be able to understand the subsequent events in Jerusalem.

²
Apart from the reasons Goguel adduces, there are substantial reasons for considering the Jerusalem Ministry to have been of greater duration than is implied in the Gospels. It appears that for several days, if not weeks, He "daily taught in the Temple" retiring at night to Bethany. (The saying "O Jerusalem" (Mtt.23:37,39 and Lk.13:34,35) would be unintelligible if Jesus had not exercised a ministry of considerable duration at Jerusalem). The implications are that He came primarily to work and not to die. The Temple seems to have been made the storm centre of His efforts at reform. His object was the purification/

1. See Manson's "Commentary on Luke", p.216.
2. "La Vie de Jésus", pp.398,399. He claims that the incident of the Temple clearing as is indicated by the Fourth Gospel did not properly belong to the events of Jesus' final ministry in Jerusalem and that the synoptic accounts indicate that the incident is an isolated fragment which has no relation to the words with which it is connected. It is plausible but far from proven. He thinks that it was early at the feast of Tabernacles that He arrived at Jerusalem, remaining until December (3 months) when He again retired into Perea, to return 6 days before Easter. Relying upon this Johannine "debris" he concludes that Jesus only wished to teach and preach and did not wish to come into conflict with the authorities. pp.384,389.

purification of that national institution which^{was}/the life centre of Judaism. The tendency of our Gospels is de-nationalizing, but the account of a national reform largely constituted the material with which they worked.

In order to arrive at the exact nature of this Temple reform which Jesus attempted, it is necessary to determine what had been His general attitude to the Cultus as reflected in the course of His whole ministry. It may, I think, be truly enough said, that prior to Caesarea Philippi, there is very little, if any, of the Gospel record of that period that reveals Jesus in open hostility to the cult as practised at Jerusalem.

Jesus and the Cultus.

It is difficult to define Jesus' attitude to the cult in Jerusalem during this first part of His ministry. Oesterley is quite certain that Jesus must have taken part in the worship of the Temple, otherwise he thinks it impossible to understand the absence of any reprimand from His enemies, if He neglected this duty.¹ However, apart from certain passages in the Fourth Gospel (3:20, 7:20-44) there is no evidence that Jesus could have been present at the Temple during this first part of His ministry. And any conclusions which can be drawn from the frequency of His appearance in the Temple during the Jerusalem ministry are entirely controlled by what one regards to be the primary motive of Jesus being in the Temple at all. Consequently, those/

1. "The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy", pp.85, 86.

those later occasions must be left out of the question that we are dealing with, at present. As mentioned already, the Galilean ministry points to a general acquiescence in the Levitical system. Jesus, for instance, bids the lepers show themselves to the priests (Mtt.8:4, Lk.17:14). But there are two other instances which may be said to contain the germ of what later became the express denial of the efficacy of the Levitical sacrificial system (Mk.2:26; Mtt.12:5-7). Even in these cases it cannot be said that Jesus repudiates sacrifice per se, but they indicate the subordination of the ceremonial to the primary claims of mercy and love. In Mk.2:26, Jesus replies to the Pharisees who rebuke Him for plucking corn. He contrasts the ritual demand of Law and Temple with the simple needs of men, and says that the latter surpasses the former. He implies that there is something fundamentally wrong with any institution that awards more merit to the ceremonial act than to the moral. This need not mean as Plooiv seems to think, that He questions the whole validity of the Temple service, but it does indicate a doubt already existing in Jesus' mind about the inherent value of the Levitical service.¹ The passage, Mtt.12:5-7, requires the interpretation not merely that the claims of mercy and love are prior to those of the Temple. There is a double point to Jesus' argument here: He Himself is greater than Temple and priesthood, "The priests profane the Sabbath, but I say unto you One greater than the Temple (and Levitical priesthood) is here".

1. See Expository Times xlii, p.36, article "Jesus and the Temple", by Dr. D. Plooiv.

here". Then He continues "I do not care for sacrifices but for mercy only". The main contrast to my mind then, is, that drawn between the value and efficacy of ^{the} Temple and its ministrants and His own person and ministry. He does not say that He will do away with all this Temple service, but plainly He regards His person and message as superseding and rendering obsolete the whole system.

Windisch claims that Jesus never attacked the manner of sacrifice - which in a sense is true enough of the Galilean period. He writes: " Mtt.5:23f, 23:16-22, Mk.11:15-17 indicate that Jesus recognized the worthlessness of these customs, but He did not refer this matter to His own authority or achievement but rather to the innate nature of the thing¹". He has failed to take into consideration this passage which singularly alters the definiteness of his conclusion (Mt.12:5-7). Again in the case of Mtt.17:25-27, which Windisch admits, ~~Jesus is shown~~ acting upon His own authority and possessing a peculiar and divine grace which makes Him and His disciples free from ceremonies and cults.

Now the existence of such an attitude, on the part of Jesus during His Galilean ministry, indicates, as we have remarked, that there was already in His mind the germ of what, in His Jerusalem ministry, became the explicit denial of the whole Judaistic religious economy. The tendency among commentators is to regard the above passages as not involving such an /

1. "Der Hebraerbrief", p.130.

an emphatic contrast. However, I believe that the minimizing of their implications, is due to a too strict reliance upon the evangelists' testimony that Jesus did not actually mean that He would destroy the Temple. Whereas, as we shall have reason to see, He meant exactly what He said. It is due, too, to the fact that prior to Caesarea Philippi, His circumstances did not throw Him in contact with the hierarchy in Jerusalem. Hence His appearance of acquiescence in the order of things there (Mtt.8:4; Lk.17:14).¹ Furthermore, our opinion of Jesus' attitude to the Temple has been controlled, too greatly, by most of the accounts in Acts which show the first disciples conforming to the rites of the Temple - even Paul compromised and submitted to the ritual Law of the Temple. Even this, we believe, is in disobedience to the explicit action and teaching of Jesus. For the present it will suffice to point to one other incident which confirms our contention (Jn.4:21f) "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem..... must worship Him in spirit and in truth".

If we are justified in holding that the Galilean period of Jesus' ministry shows Him, as having hinted on more occasions than one, that there was something fundamentally wrong with the Jerusalem cult, then the definite challenge which the Jerusalem ministry was of the whole hierarchical/

1.W.O.E.Oesterley (Ibid.supra p.96) argues from the fact that the liturgy of the Synagogue was based upon that of the Temple; but even Jesus' presence in the Synagogue does not necessarily imply His acceptance of and agreement with it as being the final and only proper approach to God.

an emphatic contrast. However, I believe that the minimizing of their implications, is due to a too strict reliance upon the evangelists' testimony that Jesus did not actually mean that He would destroy the Temple. Whereas, as we shall have reason to see, He meant exactly what He said. It is due, too, to the fact that prior to Caesarea Philippi, His circumstances did not throw Him in contact with the hierarchy in Jerusalem. Hence His appearance of acquiescence in the order of things there (Mtt.8:4; Lk.17:14)¹. Furthermore, our opinion of Jesus' attitude to the Temple has been controlled, too greatly, by most of the accounts in Acts which show the first disciples conforming to the rites of the Temple - even Paul compromised and submitted to the ritual Law of the Temple. Even this, we believe, is in disobedience to the explicit action and teaching of Jesus. For the present it will suffice to point to one other incident which confirms our contention (Jn.4:21f) "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem..... must worship Him in spirit and in truth".

If we are justified in holding that the Galilean period of Jesus' ministry shows Him, as having hinted on more occasions than one, that there was something fundamentally wrong with the Jerusalem cult, then the definite challenge which the Jerusalem ministry was of the whole hierarchical/

1.W.O.E.Oesterley (Ibid.supra p.96) argues from the fact that the liturgy of the Synagogue was based upon that of the Temple; but even Jesus' presence in the Synagogue does not necessarily imply His acceptance of and agreement with it as being the final and only proper approach to God.

hierarchical system, can be understood as the culmination of what had been running in His mind on these previous occasions. Until He determined to go up to Jerusalem, He had been content to countenance, but was far from approving of, the Levitical cult.

His Jerusalem ministry marks a complete rupture with the religious authorities of the time. Though this is not necessarily the implication of the cleansing of the Temple, it is a conclusion which is justified by the succeeding events and sayings of Jesus while at Jerusalem. The Temple Cleansing, we take to belong to this final period of Jesus' ministry, not that the Synoptic position can be proven to be the more historical,¹ but because it forms a fitting introduction to the reform efforts He made at the time. Bacon writes: "It was His method of raising the standard of reform. Every prophet in Israel had availed himself of similar symbolic means".²

The incident represents a dramatic call to the nation to engage in a reformation which is to begin with a purifying of the House of Prayer. There is no mention of interference with the priestly services, no evidence of an intention/

1. See Goguel: "La Vie de Jésus", pp.399 ff. and J.A. Robinson: "The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel", p. 25. "There is not enough evidence to determine the question, but there is enough to forbid an off-hand decision in favour of the Synoptics". Also see A.H. McNeile: "St. Matthew" (p.300), where he refrains from determining either for or against the Synoptic position. The Fourth evangelist may have possessed a tradition to that effect and it becomes a question of whether the weight of the three Synoptic evangelists is proof that their's is the more authentic.
2. "The Apostolic Message", p.234.

intention to abolish animal or vegetable sacrifice. But there are genuine reasons for questioning these very conclusions which the Gospel accounts entail. In the first place, the tradition has evidently been the subject of controversy, by reason of slightly divergent accounts of the evangelists as to the details of what took place. This is most obvious from the Lukan account, (19:45,46). Luke minimizes the importance of the Temple cleansing, and does not make this a cause like Mark of the murderous designs of the chief priests. Luke finds the cause in Jesus' daily teaching in the Temple, referring the question of His authority, to the previously mentioned teaching rather than to the Cleansing incident. Pfleiderer remarking on the Lukan version of the incident, writes: "Apparently Luke disliked anything which looked like a revolt against established custom and order"¹. Then the wide difference of opinion as to its time of occurrence between the Synoptics and John may indicate a later, real difficulty about its original significance. Moreover, the isolated and inharmonious position, which Goguel has indicated that it occupies in the narratives, points not only as he assumes to its not belonging to the context in which it is recorded, but points as definitely to a change having been made in the tradition. The change took place for the same dogmatic reason that the saying of Jesus, re: the destruction of the Temple underwent modification. (The full/

1. "Primitive Christianity", vol.ii. p.175.

full significance of that saying ^{regarding} the Temple was a shock to the Jewish mind.¹ The evangelists turned the edge of the saying by giving it a symbolic meaning. However Stephen did not, he accepted the words literally (Acts 7:37,42,48,49) and so in his prayer before his death (7:60f.). The tradition of the Cleansing incident, had it originally reported an interference with priestly duties, or any destructive intention relating to the cult practice, would be sure to have been subjected to modification as in the case of the saying.

The acceptance of the evangelical accounts provoke the hypothetical question: if only a reform of the Temple worship was attempted by Jesus, how can this possibly be squared with the previous attitude attributed to Him by the evangelists, of preaching the inwardness of worship? Our Lord's zeal for the outward ceremonial purity of the Temple simply cannot be reconciled with the contrary attitude they have attributed to Him. We are, I believe, compelled to doubt either one or the other, and for the reasons mentioned above, contend that something, which He had said or done in the Temple at the time, has been omitted from all the accounts. But since we possess no reliable knowledge of such, there is an alternative course by which the Cleansing incident can be reconciled with the saying ^{regarding} destruction, namely: that granted the ministry in Jerusalem was of considerable duration, it is possible that/

1. See Goguel: "La Vie de Jésus", p.491.

that an attempt at reformation was made by Jesus, and when the Jews turned a deaf ear to Jesus' words, He then declared the whole system to be a hopeless one.

There is another significance which the incident has besides being simply a reform gesture. It was we believe¹ deliberately Messianic. If not, then it would appear that there is nothing Messianic about any part of Jesus' conduct in Jerusalem. As Burkitt writes: "It is the most public scene in the career of Jesus..... He went out of His way, so to speak, to cleanse the Temple. Therefore, it ought to be for us a very significant index² of His mind and purpose". Burkitt regards it as Messianic because of the scribal question as to His authority for His action (Mk.12:27 ff). Provided it is an index to His mind and purpose, it is also definitely an index to His thought of His own Messianic role. And the character of this office is not as uncertain as is often thought.

To the question of His authority, He replies by an appeal to the authority of John the Baptist (Mk.11:27-33). Now this may only indicate a subtle reply to confuse His interrogators, yet again it may, as some have taken it, be³ an association of His mission with that of the Baptist. Consequently, the Messianic role which apparently some, as we/

1. The opinion of many is that there is nothing particularly Messianic about the incident. i.e. Cadman "Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem", p.120; McNeile's commentary "Matthew", p.300.

2 See "History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge", chapter 'Life of Jesus', p.233.

3. See Bacon: "The Apostolic Message", p.230: Also Cadman ibid.supra. p.120.

we have seen, attributed to the Baptist, has been assumed by Jesus. The Cleansing of the Temple was not by itself a capital offence. Therefore His enemies, having their suspicions confirmed as to the political character of the role He was enacting, not only by His dramatic entry into the City but by this Cleansing of the Temple, proceed at once to draw an admission from Him. They cannot have been ignorant either of the real reasons for the Baptist's death or of the similar act which had taken place under the Asmonaeon priest-king, Judas (1 Mac. iv:36-61). These grounds, though not amounting to strict proof that He was fulfilling the mission of John, and assuming the dignity of the priest-kingly Messianic ideal of ancient Israel and the role of the Messiah as contained in the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, do, at least, make it quite plausible.

Jesus' use of Psalm 110.

It is highly significant to the above conclusion that, when upon another occasion in the Temple Jesus is again questioned on His Messianic claims (Mk.12:35-37; Lk.20:41-44; Mtt.22:41-45), He quotes Psl.110. Here for the first time the Synoptists report Jesus having opened up the question of Messiahship in public. A quotation from McNeile indicates at least what meaning must not be drawn from the passage:

"It was far from being a mere dialectic victory showing that their religious leaders misunderstood the scriptures, nor was He simply disclaiming for Himself/

Himself an earthly sovereignty, still less denying the Davidic descent of the Messiah and therefore of Himself".

In much the same manner Pfleiderer disposes of many of the popular interpretations which make Jesus deny Davidic lineage and lay claim to Messiahship in a purely spiritual sense. Pfleiderer maintains that Jesus is claiming Messiahship in some traditional sense of the term: "as the theocratic Head of the people of God, who should take the place of the existing hierarchy"¹. Apparently Jesus dis-claims the adequacy of the popular Davidic conception of Messiahship without disclaiming Davidic descent. Many think that He suggests a higher title upon the grounds that Jesus insists that Messiahship is not something connected with rights of birth. This seems to be the case, but there is no warrant, as these scholars seem to think, that this higher title belongs to a super-mundane Being. If such had been Jesus' intention He would have quoted from Daniel or Enoch and not from the 110th Psalm.

It is unnecessary to look outside of that Psalm for His conception of His Messianic title. He does not quote verse 4, but if His purpose, in using the Psalm at all, was what the majority of scholars believe, namely, to indicate His conception of the office and to correct their mis-conception, then He uses the Psalm to tell them that He is the Messiah after the order of Melchizedek. It is surely making the matter more difficult than it really is, to say, with/

1. See "Primitive Christianity", Vol.11, pp.161,162.

Himself an earthly sovereignty, still less denying the Davidic descent of the Messiah and therefore of Himself".

In much the same manner Pfleiderer disposes of many of the popular interpretations which make Jesus deny Davidic lineage and lay claim to Messiahship in a purely spiritual sense. Pfleiderer maintains that Jesus is claiming Messiahship in some traditional sense of the term: "as the theocratic Head of the people of God, who should take the place of the existing hierarchy"¹. Apparently Jesus dis-claims the adequacy of the popular Davidic conception of Messiahship without disclaiming Davidic descent. Many think that He suggests a higher title upon the grounds that Jesus insists that Messiahship is not something connected with rights of birth. This seems to be the case, but there is no warrant, as these scholars seem to think, that this higher title belongs to a super-mundane Being. If such had been Jesus' intention He would have quoted from Daniel or Enoch and not from the 110th Psalm.

It is unnecessary to look outside of that Psalm for His conception of His Messianic title. He does not quote verse 4, but if His purpose, in using the Psalm at all, was what the majority of scholars believe, namely, to indicate His conception of the office and to correct their mis-conception, then He uses the Psalm to tell them that He is the Messiah after the order of Melchizedek. It is surely making the matter more difficult than it really is, to say, with/

1. See "Primitive Christianity", Vol.11, pp.161,162.

Chapter 1X

with Cheyne,¹ "that Jesus designed to suggest a higher title - viz: 'The Son of God'", and, with Burkitt, that He points to² a personage "like the one in the Similitudes of Enoch". Such conclusions are too greatly controlled by the opinion that Jesus merely came to Jerusalem to die - making no claim to earthly sovereignty - and the ignorance of the fact that the priest-kingship of the Messiah was a higher and more ideal form than the popular expectation of a political deliverer like David. It ignores, too, the further fact that priest-kingship was a familiar enough idea, though held in a modified form from that of the ancient national ideal; it had become in some way to be associated with the House of Levi through its adoption by the Asmonaeans.

It cannot be known whether Jesus is here asserting that the ideal Messianic role is His, or insisting on the Asmonaeon claim. The Cleansing of the Temple incident may point to the latter, but the Messianic Entry would be some evidence that the ancient ideal of the King of Peace was not foreign to His thought. It may indeed very well be the case that in His use of the Psalm the ancient Davidic ideal may be in His mind. Prof. Scott writes: "throughout the passage the term 'Son of David' is used in a pregnant sense to denote not mere physical descent, but likeness in³ character and vocation". Did Jesus know of the priest-kingly/

1. "The Christian Use of the Psalms", pp.237,238.
2. In the volume "History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge", pp.233,234.
3. Ch. "The Kingdom and the Messiah", (p.186) in "The Kingdom of God"

:kingly character and vocation of David? He apparently did, a fact which the Synoptics record: "Have you not read how it is written that David went into the House of God...." (Mtt.12:1-8; Mk.2:23 ff). This does not say that He recognized in the act, David's exercise of the priestly office or his having set aside the official priests in virtue of his own priesthood, but Jesus was a student of the life of David and the fact of his priestly acts could not have escaped His notice.

The Saying re. the Temple Destruction.

The question of the order of events in the Jerusalem ministry cannot be adequately dealt with in ^{the} limited scope of this chapter. All that can be said with any degree of accuracy about the position of the saying "I will destroy this Temple", is that it must have been spoken toward the end of the ministry in Jerusalem; for it appears to be that which finally determined the Jewish authorities to take drastic action. (It formed a part of the accusation at the trial, and He is taunted with it when on the Cross). Goguel is of the opinion that the bulk of the action lies in the period from the Feast of Tabernacles, in September or October, until some three months later when He retired into Perea. This ministry had so aroused the authorities that almost immediately upon His return before Easter, they seized Him and put Him to death. The saying re^{ard} the Destruction of the Temple fell within that three month period, and would, because of its Messianic implications and condemnation of the whole Jewish religious economy, have brought Him at once to His death, had it not been for His strong/

strong popular support. (The saying "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem...." Goguel thinks was uttered when Jesus left the City after His effort to rally the nation to the cause of His reform, and beholding the City He cried out and wept over it¹).

Thus for Goguel the saying regarding² the Destruction of the Temple can only mean that Jesus, having failed to bring about a reform of the Temple which would bring it back to its true end, He Himself said that He would destroy it.²

The following is a digest of the argument:

"The meaning of that reply was the end of the present state of affairs, the downfall of Judaism, and the coming not only of a new cult, but of the Kingdom of God, which would be the brilliant justification of the original Divine character of His mission. Early that saying had offended the Christians to the point that they had not believed that Jesus had really pronounced it. Under the influence of this sentiment John had given it a symbolic meaning and the Synoptists had said that Jesus evaded replying, thus converting a dialogue of capital importance to a role of simple controversy in which Jesus proves Himself a superior dialectician than His adversaries".³

Easton, too, is of the opinion that the saying in its original colour must have been obnoxious to the early Christians.⁴

1. "La Vie de Jésus", p.389. This book is probably too recent for scholarship as a whole to have passed an opinion upon the value of his conclusions. Except for the fact that many hesitate in following him in this book as in an earlier one, where he is thought to have given too much weight to the evidence of the Johannine debris. Whatever the defects in his argument for a re-arrangement of the events of the Jerusalem ministry, his interpretation of the significance of that ministry and of the events is not necessarily controlled by his arrangement, no matter how arbitrary it may be deemed.
2. Ibid. supra. p.387.
3. Ibid. p.401.
4. "Christ in the Gospels", p.170.

Christians. He points out how that at the Trial they protest that it was made by false witnesses as in Mark, how Matthew gives the saying a turn which Christians could accept, while Luke omits it and John explains it as allegorical.

The very persistence of the saying in the narratives argues for its authenticity. It was true that Jesus made the statement, the evangelists testify to that; but it was of such scandalous import to the early Christians that the evangelists are seen trying to turn the point of it, not only ^{their reports of} ~~in~~ the trial but in their accounts of the prophecy of destruction which the Synoptists attach to the little apocalypse. If it originally had been but the prophecy of the events of 70, or of an eschatological doom, it could not have been one of the charges preferred against Him at the trial. For as Goguel maintains, just such an announcement, of a calamity which would strike Jerusalem, was made by Jesus, Son of Annas in 62 A.D. Such announcement did not constitute a crime or a blasphemy but was simply referred to the Roman tribunal¹. What was peculiar to the saying of Jesus was, that He had Himself said, He would destroy the Temple. The parallelism, between the ascription to Jesus of such intention and the prophecy in Mk.13:1,2, is not apparent. ~~The fact~~ ^{The fact} may be explained as a variant reading; and the evangelists insertion of the little Apocalypse here, it may be conjectured, served a real/

1. Ibid.supra p.495.

real purpose with regard to an objectionable saying; it becomes the announcement of a national catastrophe, but Jesus Himself is not the agent of it.

Apparently the announcement of the Temple's destruction, whether we consider¹ it as a prophecy or² as an avowed intention of aggression on His own part - which is unlikely - was regarded by the high-priest at the Trial as a Messianic declaration. The idea was current among the Jews that in Messianic times, either a new Temple or its restoration was to be looked for.¹ If Goguel is right in seeing in this saying the pronouncement of doom upon the whole Jewish religious economy, then what he and Easton both regard as an attempt to cover up and deny, in the accounts of the trial, what was a scandal to the early Church's professed respect for the Temple and its sacrifices, and Stephen's condemnation of Judaism as one long act of idolatry from the days in the wilderness (Acts 7), points to the saying having an authentic basis in the teaching of Jesus. Consequently, Ploov is not far from the truth when he writes:

"Jesus wished to entirely abolish the Temple and sacrifices and all it includes; in its stead a new spiritual Temple was to be erected".²

He is right in thinking that Jesus aimed at abolishing the then existing, official Judaism; but it is far from clear that Jesus conceived of a cultless religion. He condemned the Levitical form of sacrifice then in existence, but it is unlikely that He included all sacrifice per se.

Was/

1. See Strack-Billerbeck's Thesaurus, pp.1003 ff, quoted by Goguel (ibid.) p.494.
2. Ibid.supra p.38.

Was it upon this explicit break with, and condemnation of the Temple cult, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is drawing upon, for his elaborate denial of the merits of the Levitical institution? At the very least we may contend that his argument has the authority of the words of Jesus spoken against the Temple. To which may be added, as corroboration of such being the substance of His thought, the parable of the Husbandmen and the Heir; concerning which Manson writes: "The Lord of the Vineyard will oust and supersede the present unworthy ¹lessees", (Mk.12:1-11). His attack here is only against the administrators of the Levitical order, but the order itself is directly impugned in the incident of the cursing of the fig tree (Mk.11:13). Commentators have been agreed in seeing it as a symbolic denunciation of the Jewish nation. There is no reason to see in it a ^{part of Jesus,} prophecy on the ²part of a political extermination. The political fortunes of His nation do not appear to have had any place in His teaching. He had come to Jerusalem to reform the religious institution. But He had found the people obdurate and their leaders throughout Israel's history unworthy; the very system they guarded was barren. Leviticalism was to be cut down that it might no longer cumber the earth.

The bearing, upon this conclusion, of the twin parables of the Old and New Wineskins and the Old Garment and the New Cloth, is obvious. When the author of the Epistle/

1. "Commentary on Luke", p.222.

2. See Klausner: "Jesus of Nazareth", p.37. He quotes a Rabbinical saying of Jesus re. a venial priesthood.

Epistle to the Hebrews argues: "but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned", (Heb.6:8); he is not only here reproducing the thought of our Lord when He used the analogy of the fig tree; but our author's whole argument for the obsolescence of the Levitical system, shows him to be at one with Jesus' final condemnation of the religious system of Judaism as fruitless. The first disciples and leaders of the early Church had zealously denied that any such offensive teaching could be attributed to Jesus. But the very extremity, to which they were driven to deny the authenticity of the saying ^{regarding} the Temple destruction, can be seen in the evangelists' accounts of the trial. It hastened the death of Jesus; and when it was again insisted upon, it was the cause of the first Christian martyrdom. Years after the death of Stephen, arose another redoubtable champion of the truth, our author of the Epistle "Hebrews".

The Anointing at Bethany.

The next event of importance for an estimate of the character and purpose of the Jerusalem ministry, and its relation to Jesus' Messianic consciousness, is that of the anointing at Bethany, (Mk.14:3-9; Mtt.26:6-13; Jn.12:1-8). It is a common opinion that it points to a Messianic anoint-¹ing of Jesus. Little opinion has been expressed as to the exact/

1. So B.W.Bacon regards it, "Beginnings of Gospel Story", p.199 ff; also Pfleiderer "Primitive Christianity", Vol.2, pp.35 and 71; McNeile quotes from Preuschen's article Z.N.T.W.1902 pp.252 ff., to the effect that anointing of the body at burial was unknown in Israel, ("St.Matthew", p.376). /^{AS}

Chapter LX

exact Messianic role into which He was anointed. It is idle to conjecture that there was no particular Messianic title in mind on the occasion, as it is, also, to assume that it was merely a consecration to the role of Son of Man who was later to come upon the clouds of Heaven. For in the Book of Daniel, from which the figure was originally derived, there is no expectation of an anointed king. The "Anointed One" who is also a Prince, mentioned in Daniel ch.9, is the High-priest (9:25,29)¹. The anointing must have been a consecration to some specific task, which He was then engaged upon, rather than the consecration of a Heavenly Being, whose task was yet in the future. There is a temporal significance attached to this anointing. But unless some light is thrown upon the incident by the other events, we can know nothing more than that it was symbolic of His Messianic calling. For the records of the incident do not specify the exact function to which He was appointed. However, there is this much to bear in mind, that though the incident recorded here may only be symbolic of the setting aside of Jesus as "the anointed", the Messiah in a general sense, it need not necessarily have only had this symbolic significance. The evangelists are unaware that it even had a Messianic significance and explain it as a fore-anointing to burial (Mk.14:8).

The custom of anointing was confined exclusively to the consecration of high priests, which custom they had inherited/

1. See Kennett "Old Testament Essays", p.230.

inherited from the priest-kings. Gressmann thinks that the custom had from the very first a priestly significance, but that this aspect of the custom was not known in later times.¹ It was certainly taken up into the idea of the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal of the priest-king. Whether in the time of our Lord the term "Messiah" had any priestly connotation, it is impossible to ascertain. But at least the idea had been revived by the Asmonaeans who claimed to rule as "anointed priests". There is nothing in the accounts of the anointing at Bethany that shows Jesus to have been consecrated to a similar temporal dignity, as were the Asmonaeon leaders, or to the Messianic role associated with such as John Hyrcanus. Still there is even less evidence for thinking that the anointing in this case could have pointed to a popular acclaim of Jesus as the Scion of the House of David - a role which He had on more than one occasion repudiated. After all, this was not the only form of popular Jewish Messianic expectation.² The idea of the priest-king was also a popular Messianic conception, which, as we have seen, was in all probability the form of Messianic title ascribed to John the Baptist. That the anointing at Bethany, may have been an anointing to a similar office by popular choice of Jesus, is not unlikely in view of the other events of the Jerusalem ministry, /

1. "Der Messias", p.4.

2. "Beginnings of Christianity" Jackson and Lake, write of the Messianism of the time: "The wholly false notion still widely current that the Jewish expectation in the time of Christ, is a leader in wars and conquest is derived from the Targum which scholars thought to date before the first century before the Christian era". vol.1, p.362.

ministry, the record of which shows the evangelists, suppressing any ideas which point to Jesus having laid claim to worldly sovereignty of any description, or having come to Jerusalem for any but the sole purpose of dying.

Jesus' evident failure to institute a reform movement left discouraged and hopeless, those who had come to Jerusalem full of enthusiastic hope, which is clear from the gladness of the Jerusalem Entry. The Resurrection experiences changed what had every aspect of defeat into amazing victory. Ready to hand, was Jewish Apocalypticism to which Jesus had Himself probably appealed at the moment He saw the hopelessness of His cause of reform. Indeed, if Jesus used the term "Son of Man" at all, either from the time of Baptism or from Caesarea Philippi onwards, it was merely to cloak His real Messianic role. Torrey¹ remarks:

"The title king was a dangerous term for a Jew, so that "Son of Man" because more cryptic was used, but the Messianic king was always in the background".

This I believe was the Messianic Secret, and that what Judas betrayed was the anointing, at Bethany, of Jesus to the secret role of Priest-king after the order of Melchizedek.

Thus the events of the Jerusalem ministry came to be interpreted in the light of One who travelled there to die that He might return in glory upon the clouds of Heaven. But/

1. Chapter by C.C.Torrey in "Studies in Early Christianity" edited by Case, p.306.

Chapter 1X

But the fact was that those events proved almost impossible¹ of reconciliation with this later eschatological outlook.

In His Resurrection and Ascension Jesus came to be regarded as the exalted Son of Man, and the facts of His life were strained to fit that conception. It is a question of whether the evangelists - for Paul does not speak of Him as Son of Man - were truer to the facts of the life of the historic Jesus in so picturing Him, than was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who thought of His exalted life in terms of a great High-priest and King who had entered into the Heavenly Holy of Holies?

The Trial

To take up once more the charge or charges upon which Jesus was condemned, with special reference to the accounts of the Trial, we find additional proof that the main accusation, upon which Jesus was condemned, was of such a nature as to explain both Jesus' condemnation and the early Church's denial that He had actually made the statement. It is first to be remarked that it is the high-priestly rulers who take the/

1. We have only been able here to make the bare statement of dissent from any form of Apocalypticism having been held by Jesus up to the close of His ministry. The limits of this chapter prevent discussing anything but the positive non-apocalyptic elements in this period of Jesus' ministry. Our answer, to any form of apocalyptic interpretation of the life of Jesus, is simply that the genuinely non-apocalyptic element in the Gospels present an adequate picture of the life of Jesus, and can also explain the transformation of the traditional material of the Gospels by the adoption of apocalyptic forms, by the early Church.

1

the lead in pressing for the arrest of Jesus. This fact is commented upon by McNeile who asserts that "whether or not there was a law forbidding arrest on a feast day, the letter of the law was less important than fear of the Romans".² This is a point which so many are unwilling to recognize; that the reform efforts of Jesus were regarded as being fraught with such danger to the existing order of things in Jerusalem and the Temple that even though of a purely religious nature, it was deemed a movement which seriously encroached upon the authority of Rome - even actually threatening it. The motif, impelling the Temple authorities to take action, was apparently the desire to get rid of One who not only had challenged their authority but what was worse, had condemned the very institution from which they derived their authority. This was the conclusion arrived at from an examination of the saying regarding³ the Temple destruction. Goguel has been quoted to the effect that this saying constituted the charge of blasphemy, namely, that Jesus Himself said: "I will destroy this Temple and rebuild it in three days". Kennett is of a similar opinion, he writes:

"It is highly significant in the light of St. Stephen's trial, that an attempt was made (unsuccessfully through failure to secure complete agreement between two witnesses) to convict our Lord of having said: 'I will destroy.....'. Evidently it was the alleged desire to destroy the Temple which constituted the blasphemy or sacrilege".³

We/

1. Plummer (I.C.C. on Luke, p.519) says: "It was the Sadducees, the servile upholders of Roman authority who took the lead against Christ".
2. McNeile: "Commentary" St. Matthew", p.373.
3. "Old Testament Essays", p.243.

We might ask what other claim could have constituted a blasphemy? Mark infers that it was Jesus' claim to be the Son of Man (Dan.7:13 f) in answer to the High-priest, but it is doubtful if this was considered blasphemous. According to the tract Sanhedrim (7:7), the pronouncement of the Divine name was blasphemous. But it has been doubted whether the principles, formulated therein, were in use at the time of Jesus. Neither could the mere charge of being the Messiah have been so considered. There were numerous pretendant Messiahs at the time, but there is no indication of their having come into conflict with the Sanhedrin. John interprets the blasphemy to be, that Jesus had said: "He was the Son of God"; this, however, may only be Johannine apologetic; so in Luke (22:70) "Art thou the Son of God?" At most it is scarcely probable that the claim of a man to be the Son of God would have been viewed by the Sadducees as blasphemous. Kennett asserts that this is out of the question in view of the language of Psl.2:7, 87:4-6, 89:26 and Mal.1:6, 2:10¹.

Luke is much more specific as to the charges in his account of the accusation before Pilate (Lk.23:1-5); "we found this man perverting the nation and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar and saying that He is a King and He stirreth up the people". We notice that these charges against Jesus before Pilate in Luke's account are of a revolutionary character not dissimilar to those preferred against/

¹ See Ibid. supra p.244.

against Him before the High-priest, namely, of destructive intentions. In this respect they are almost the one and the same charge. In the case of the appearance before the High-priest, the offence is summed up under the term blasphemy. But in order to secure conviction from Pilate the kingly aspect of His reform movement was stressed. And though the evangelists' aim is to show Pilate having found Jesus' innocent, it is an assured fact that Pilate crucified Jesus as a royal pretender.

We have no reason to believe that this accusation that He claimed to be a King, was a trumped up charge in order to secure a conviction from Pilate, it was an integral part of the former accusation, of an attempt on the Temple. Easton writes concerning the matter:

"It could not have been a trumped up charge, the Jews would not have perjured themselves gratuitously, since their case was already complete, nor did it rest on malicious gossip. There have been cases of innocent men martyred on trumped up charges but in this case no one protested; that He actually claimed kingship in some sense His most ardent followers as well as His bitterest enemies passionately proclaimed. The Jews so charged - Pilate so judged - the Christians so affirmed: by what historic right then may we moderns assert that all three were wrong?" 1

Clearly in some sense He had laid claim to kingship. Jesus Himself at the Trial did not deny it. The Church has ever since maintained that His Kingdom and Kingship were not of this world. It was not the fantastic claims of an apocalyptic dreamer, which, in the first place, provoked the charge against Him. The patience of the Jerusalem authorities/

1. "Christ in the Gospels", p.170.

Chapter LX

authorities was not exhausted by a man who had visions of being a Heavenly King. Nor would they have been much concerned had this Pretender, like other revolutionaries against Roman rule, been seeking only political freedom for the nation. In that case they themselves would be unaffected. But the claims asserted in this case seriously affected them. Now the only kingly claims which intruded upon their domain were those which the Asmonaeans had once asserted; and these affected not only Rome but the Temple priesthood.

Jesus and the Sadducaic Messianic Hope.

In regard to the above conclusions, it is significant to compare the attitudes of the two Jewish parties towards Jesus, during the Jerusalem ministry. We learn from Luke, that immediately prior to His going up to Jerusalem, there was a section of the Pharisees who were on friendly terms with Jesus (Lk.13:35; 14:1). They had warned Him of Herod's designs on His life, and He was a guest in their homes. It is singular, too, that though the Gospels speak of a series of conflicts with the Pharisees, there is no conflict with the Sadducees. Something, however, later aroused their anxiety for they send a delegation to Him. (Mk.12:13). During the Jerusalem ministry, it is not the Pharisees, but the Sadducees who constitute ~~the~~ main opposition. Montefiore says:

"The Gospel narratives are so far correct that Jesus was really put to death by the Romans at the instance and instigation of the Jewish authorities, and more especially of the ruling priesthood". 1

The/

1. "The Synoptic Gospels", p.346.

The root of their grievance did not lie in any contrary theological doctrines. They were not bigoted theologians who would have quarrelled with Jesus over the doctrine of the Resurrection.¹ It is even doubtful whether their doctrine of immortality differed at all from that of Jesus. Nor again, was their hostility to Jesus caused, solely, by such efforts at reform as is instanced by the Cleansing of the Temple. There is reason to believe that the Zadokites already represented just such a reform movement within the ranks of the priesthood.² There is nothing that would indicate, that any members of that sect, were ever brought before a Roman tribunal. The suspicions, which the ^{sadducees} had of Jesus while He was still in Galilee, were seemingly amply confirmed by His conduct in Jerusalem. Everything they stood for was at stake, and they lost no time in taking action.

The Messianic hopes of the Sadducees give further insight into the motif of their opposition to Jesus. There is wide difference of opinion on the question. Schürer³ claims that they had no Messianic hope. Oesterley and Box support the view, that they believed in a Messiah from Levi.⁴ This is insisted upon by Leszynsky, who thinks that there was a great deal of controversy between the Sadducees and the Pharisees on the question of the Messianic hope.⁵

The/

1. See Pfleiderer: "Primitive Christianity", vol.2, p.82.
2. See Charles: "Fragments of a Zadokite Work", Introduction.
3. E.B. article "Sadducees"
4. "The Books of the Apocrypha", pp.148 ff.
5. "Die Sadduzaer" (Berlin 1912, p.94 f). His views are examined in an article E.R.E. vol.xi, p.45.

The Pharisees argued for a Messiah from David on the grounds of Gen.49:10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah". The strongest proof text of the Sadducees was Exodus 19:6, "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation". Conceivably they cherished these qualities for the Israelitish people in virtue of the priest-kingly character of the Messiah.¹ (It is to be noticed that these are the words with which the writer of 1 Peter describes² the Christians, 1 Pet.2:9).³ Both Lightly and Schonfield conclude that the Sadducaic hope was of a Messiah from Levi. But it does not appear that the opinion of such as Schürer and Emmet to the contrary can be altogether dismissed. The main factor for the contention that a Messiah from Levi was a typical Sadducaic hope, largely rests upon the supposed evidence of the Test of^{the} Xll Patriarchs and the Zadokite fragment. There is nothing by which to prove that the Messianic hope of the Test of the Xll Patriarchs, was held solely by recognized members of the Sadducaic party; from the fact of the popular demand for a successor other than Herod and one who was of the House of the Asmonaeans,⁴ it would appear that a Messiah after the same manner was not the exclusive hope of any party. Again, if the Zadokite Fragment represents, as it is thought to, the opinion of a sect within the Sadducaic party, then its Messianic hope need not have been the common/

1. See Charles: "Apoc. and Pseud.", vol.2, p.785.

2. "Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ", p.88ff.

3. "The Book of the Nativity of John", pp.48 ff.

4. See W.O.E. Oesterley: "A History of Israel", p.321.

A point already referred to in this Treatise ch.VI.

common property of the party as a whole. Lightly says:

"Their dominant consideration was to keep the peace and so secure their own safety. Until near the end, the movement led by Jesus seemed harmless and the Sadducees kept aloof; but once it menaced the peace of the community they quickly bestirred themselves..". 1

As has been contended, it must have been something more than a trifling reform of Temple abuses which aroused them. The Sadducees would have found themselves in an extremely uncomfortable position, if some one advanced the Messianic priest-king claim, to which their party was once associated under the Asmonaeon regime. And no matter how little significance they attached to the Messianic hope of One from Levi, there was among their extremists members a partiality still towards that expectation. There were good grounds for their fear of losing favour with the Roman authorities, if the actions and claims of Jesus were such as would identify Him with the hopes ^{which} some of their members were known to still entertain. ^a~~This was~~ matter, which their opponents, the Pharisees, would not have been slow in bringing to the attention of the Romans. They anticipated such a complication arising and took the ^{ti}initiative in having Jesus condemned.

The high priest had condemned Jesus on the grounds of an alleged intention to destroy the Temple, an affirmation, which on the face of it, threw doubt upon its sancrosanct character (Mk.14: 58 ff.). Nothing is mentioned as to the authority by which He had made that statement. Jesus/

1. See "Jewish Sects and Parties", p.155.

Jesus had not told them directly but they inferred from His use of the 110th Psalm (cf. Mk. 12:35 f., 14:62), the nature of His pretensions. When they bring Him before Pilate they name the authority by which He had acted, but it is not the royal characteristics of Messiah in the 110th Psalm by which they characterize Jesus' revolution. They guarded against any such complication, which that would involve them in, and charge Him with emulation of the Pharisaic Messianic hope, a purely military figure who refuses to pay tribute to Caesar and stirreth up the people against Rome (Lk. 23:2; Mk. 15:2-4). Luke and the early Church are agreed that this was a mis-representation of the facts. But the Sadducees had done so, not through a blind perversity in which they perjured themselves; there was a sense in which He was a revolutionary king. They were forced to protect themselves from disclosing its real significance. They did so and at the expense of their opponents, the Pharisees.

The Sadducees and the Early Church

Moreover it is only in the light of the above conclusions that the opposition, of the high-priestly party to the early Christians, can be explained. Lightly dismisses, as being without foundation, Holcher's theory that the attack of the Sadducees upon the early Church, recorded in the Book of Acts, is a falsification of the facts. He confirms our contention that the Sadducees were in the van of the opposition both during the Jerusalem ministry and in the first/

1

first persecution of the Church.

In the book of Acts (4:1 f) the priests and the captains of the Temple and the Sadducees came upon the Christians. Luke writes that, "they were grieved that they taught the people and preached through Jesus the Resurrection from the dead". It is generally conceded by scholars that the doctrine of a general Resurrection could not have been the prime motive for the Sadducaic interference. If not the doctrine, as Luke states it, of Resurrection through Christ, still it is not so obvious that the underlying pre-supposition of that doctrine had nothing to do with their attitude, namely, the belief that Christ was risen. The amazement of the high-priestly party can be imagined when they found the disciples of Him whom they thought themselves finally rid, proclaiming that He was resurrected. Their old fears were revived. They were in much the same state of mind, as was Herod Antipas, when he inquired whether Jesus were John the Baptist risen from the dead.

Again the common error of thinking that it was financial greed which had, in the first place, aroused the Sadducees against Jesus while in the Temple, fails completely in explaining their later attack on the early Church, as it falls short of the real reason for the condemnation of Jesus.² Coupled with this belief that the arch-enemy of the security of the Sadducean priesthood was resurrected, was/

1. See Lightly *ibid.* supra, Chapter Vlll.

2. Lake ("Stewardship of Faith" 1915, p.39) writes: "financial interest rather than theological hate was the real cause of the accusation of Jesus".

was the Christian belief that He was soon to return. Furthermore, when Peter and John are brought before the council, the high priest asked them saying: "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? And behold you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us" (Acts 5:28). The Sadducaic fear, here, is not that of being guilty of the crucifixion of Jesus. It was no question with them of His death sentence lacking in justification. Nor was it fear of the people in this case, any more than at the time of the Trial. In both cases their fear was, first, a fear of losing their prerogative of being guardians of the Temple and its worship, and, secondly, that the priest-kingly role of Jesus might be revealed, bringing them into discredit with the Romans; it being common knowledge that a part, at least, of the Sadducaean party held this ^{priest-kingly} expectation. The answer of Peter to the high-priest could not have allayed his fears, for Peter quotes from the 110th Psalm, characterizing Christ as a "Prince and Saviour", who is to give "repentance and forgiveness of the sins of Israel" (5:31). Peter's use of the Psalm at all, is significant; and in addition, his implication that Israel now has in Jesus another means of securing removal of sin, ~~than~~ that of the sacrificial system of the Temple. It has already been pointed out how that Stephen's speech takes up the very theme of the charge upon which Jesus was condemned by the high-priest, namely, a calling in question of the whole Judaistic system, Temple, Cult and Law (Acts 6:8; 7:54). This speech, in itself, is conclusive that the Sadducees' * interference/

was the Christian belief that He was soon to return. Furthermore, when Peter and John are brought before the council, the high priest asked them saying: "Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? And behold you have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man's blood upon us" (Acts 5:28). The Sadducaic fear, here, is not that of being guilty of the crucifixion of Jesus. It was no question with them of His death sentence lacking in justification. Nor was it fear of the people in this case, any more than at the time of the Trial. In both cases their fear was, first, a fear of losing their prerogative of being guardians of the Temple and its worship, and, secondly, that the priest-kingly role of Jesus might be revealed, bringing them into discredit with the Romans; it being common knowledge that a part, at least, of the Sadducaean party held this ^{priest-kingly} expectation. The answer of Peter to the high-priest could not have allayed his fears, for Peter quotes from the 110th Psalm, characterizing Christ as a "Prince and Saviour", who is to give "repentance and forgiveness of the sins of Israel" (5:31). Peter's use of the Psalm at all, is significant; and in addition, his implication that Israel now has in Jesus another means of securing removal of sin, ~~than~~ that of the sacrificial system of the Temple. It has already been pointed out how that Stephen's speech takes up the very theme of the charge upon which Jesus was condemned by the high-priest, namely, a calling in question of the whole Judaistic system, Temple, Cult and Law (Acts 6:8; 7:54). This speech, in itself, is conclusive that the Sadducees' * interference/

interference with the early Church, was from the same motive as was their active hostility to Jesus.

Nor was Stephen's speech simply the expression of a non-authoritative and private opinion. He was the recognized leader of a group of Seven appointed apparently to relieve the Twelve. Little is known of them except that they were chosen for less important duties than the Twelve, but they became the centre of controversy with the Temple official class. Lake writes of them: "the Seven attracted attention by their development of certain lines of thought which were probably present in the teaching of Jesus Himself, but were not taken up by the original Jerusalem community". If the nature of Jesus' Jerusalem ministry was such as we have contended, the Seven certainly were developing what was present in the teaching of Jesus; and they aroused opposition from the Temple authorities because they were being true to the issue upon which He had been condemned and crucified.

Our implication, that the priest-kingship claim of Jesus also underlay the Sadducean opposition to Jesus and the early Church, may not be so readily admitted, as is the contention, that Jesus condemned both cult and priesthood. Together with the fact of His denunciation of the Temple and its ministers, there is the implication that He regarded Himself as superseding them, either in His own person and sacrificial death or in His intention of setting up a new Temple/

1. K.Lake "The Earlier Epistles of St.Paul", p.18.

Temple and cult.¹

Attention was called in an earlier chapter (LV) to the fact that the Ante-Nicene Fathers argued for the Priesthood of Christ from the Messianic prophecies of a new Temple. But they did not deduce the doctrine therefrom. It was already, apparently, a doctrine of early Christian belief. As to that doctrine having an authentic traditional basis, other than the epistle "Hebrews", there is further evidence in an event attending the activities of Stephen and the Seven, the lines of whose teaching we have just considered. It is highly significant, that it is recorded, that at that time, "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith, (Acts 6:7). This, as has been remarked, (p.155) may be taken to indicate the association of Jesus with the priestly Messianic expectation of Malachi from which John received the charter of his mission. It needs further^{to} be re-emphasized, here, that this turning of a group of priests to Christianity points to the Seven's having taught the doctrine of Christ's true High-priesthood. It was not only the natural conclusion which hearers would draw from Stephen's speech, it is integral to the thought of the speech; and we may be reasonably certain that it was either explicitly stated, or implied in the original utterance. Else we cannot satisfactorily account for the compliance of the priests/

1. In the Book of Tobit (14:5), the writer draws a distinction between the modest little Temple as he sees it and the Temple that is to be the Temple of the Messiah. Passages in the Apocryphal writings are referred to by Oesterley and Box, "The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue" indicating that the Messiah Himself will rebuild the Temple, (p.222).

priests who obviously looked for a priestly Messiah, if not the ancient Messianic ideal of One who was both King and Priest. And the Seven's teaching was founded upon a genuine aspect of our Lord's. Are we not here in touch with the source of the doctrine in the Heads of Testimonies of the Fathers and the "Confession" of the Epistle "Hebrews"? It is not unlikely. There is certain other evidence which we may now consider.

Subsidiary Evidence of Jesus' Claim to Priesthood.

In Josephus (Ant.xx.9.1) mention is made of the death of James the brother of our Lord, at the hands of Ananus the high priest. Heges^p ipus, who is quoted by Eusebius, gives a different version (H.E.ii.23), in which the blame is not attached to the high priest but to some seven Jewish sects. It is difficult to decide which is the more authentic tradition; Lightly suggests that in view of the treatment of Paul by the high priest, such behaviour as that which Josephus attributes to Ananus is altogether likely to be the true version of the matter.¹ But Eusebius seems to have taken it for granted that there is nothing contradictory about the two accounts; for he quotes from the Josephan account, and apparently assumed, that even though Heges^p ipus related that the death of James was at the hands of certain sects of Jews, that Ananus was the real instigator of the crime. The passage quoted by Eusebius relates how that James succeeded to the government of the Church in conjunction with the Apostles and continues:

"He/

1. "Jewish Sects and Parties", p.170.

"He was holy from his mother's womb and drank neither strong drink nor did he eat flesh..... he alone was permitted to enter into the holy place, for he wore not woollen but linen garments, and he was in the habit of entering alone into the Temple and was frequently found upon his knees, begging forgiveness for the people, so that his knees became hard like those of a camel in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God and asking forgiveness for the people". 1

Hegesip^pus represents the cause of his death to be in the fact that he preached Jesus Christ (10). But whatever the value of the matter Hegesip^pus relates - and it must go back to some genuine record of the death of James - it is significant that he relates, together with James' preaching of Jesus Christ, the additional fact of his wearing of the linen garment, and entering into the holy place. The priestly claims of James must have been the prime reason for the action of Ananus in having him put an end to, at once. And it is this factor which is stressed in the account of the same matter by Epiphanius (Haeres xxix.4). This passage reads:

"He (James the Just) was of David's race being the son of Joseph.....and that he officiated after the manner of the ancient priesthood. Wherefore also he was permitted once a year to enter into the Holy of Holies, as the law commanded the high priest according to that which is written; for many before us have told of him, both Eusebius and Clement and others. Furthermore he was entitled to wear the high-priestly diadem upon his head as the aforementioned trustworthy men have attested in their memoirs". 2

Lawlor contends that Epiphanius had direct knowledge of Hegesip^pus/

1. H.E.11.23:4-7 (Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, vol.1).
2. Patrologiae, J.P.Migne Tomus XLI. p.396.

Heges ipus^p and produced this passage independently of the parallel passage in Eusebius.¹ Eisler, however, explains the difference to be due to Epiphanius' use of a MS which differed from our extant MS.. This he proves from the fact that the Syriac and Latin versions of Eusebius read that James had access not to the holy place as in our version, but to the Holy of Holies.²

These sources though not above suspicion, nevertheless are known to embody genuine old tradition and certainly there is much reason to believe that they offer the real explanation of James' martyrdom at the instigation of Ananus the high-priest, namely, that he had pretensions to the high-priesthood and even officiated in the Temple and entered into the Holy of Holies. It is difficult to understand the motive for the growth of such a tradition, if there were not a genuine element of fact in the account. Heges ipus^p, who apparently lived at the close of the Apostolic age, could not at that time have had any ulterior motive for adducing such evidence. For the Temple was no longer in existence, and there could have been little desire to relate any Apostolic action as having been associated with an institution which perished as an act of God.³ Until suitable and adequate reasons can be adduced by scholars for the artificial growth of such a tradition as that James wore the garments of a high-priest, it would appear that the legendary hypothesis will not do.

Eisler/

1. See H.J.Lawlor: "Eusebiana" (1912), p.10.
2. See "The Messiah Jesus and John Baptist", p.245.
3. See Eusebius: H.E.ii.23,19.

Eisler attests that James wore the high-priestly garments by virtue of his being a Rechabite and married into a Levite family. But Eisler's whole theory of the connection of the family of Jesus with a Nazorite sect of which John the Baptist was the founder, rests, as we have indicated above (p.148), almost entirely upon the authenticity of certain Mandaeen documents which most scholars regard as originating not earlier than the 5th. century. I believe that, if there existed a reliable tradition to the effect that James had worn the diadem of the high-priest, it owes its origin not so much to its having a basis of fact in the life of James - though that is not improbable in view of the action of Ananus in putting him to death - as it has been due to some saying or gesture of Jesus while in the Temple, and to the priest-kingly role which, largely unknown to the Jews but known to His disciples and adherents of His movement, He had elected to follow. Indeed such priestly claims of Jesus would account both for the growth of a legend of James wearing the high-priestly dress and for James having actually been a rival to the high-priest Ananus.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri No.840

Our grounds, hitherto, for asserting this priestly claim to have been at the root of Jesus' Messianic consciousness, have been adduced from the Evangelists' accounts of the Jerusalem ministry. Besides the tradition with regard to James, there sprang up others which, whether recording fact or legend, may have some value in determining the/

Eisler attests that James wore the high-priestly garments by virtue of his being a Rechabite and married into a Levite family. But Eisler's whole theory of the connection of the family of Jesus with a Nazorite sect of which John the Baptist was the founder, rests, as we have indicated above (p.148), almost entirely upon the authenticity of certain Mandæan documents which most scholars regard as originating not earlier than the 5th. century. I believe that, if there existed a reliable tradition to the effect that James had worn the diadem of the high-priest, it owes its origin not so much to its having a basis of fact in the life of James - though that is not improbable in view of the action of Ananus in putting him to death - as it has been due to some saying or gesture of Jesus while in the Temple, and to the priest-kingly role which, largely unknown to the Jews but known to His disciples and adherents of His movement, He had elected to follow. Indeed such priestly claims of Jesus would account both for the growth of a legend of James wearing the high-priestly dress and for James having actually been a rival to the high-priest Ananus.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri No.840

Our grounds, hitherto, for asserting this priestly claim to have been at the root of Jesus' Messianic consciousness, have been adduced from the Evangelists' accounts of the Jerusalem ministry. Besides the tradition with regard to James, there sprang up others which, whether recording fact or legend, may have some value in determining the/

the significance of those Jerusalem events. In the first
¹
 place there is the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (No.840) Grenfell
 and Hunt's translation runs thus:

2

"And He took them and led them into the agneuterion,
 Then there came a certain high priest called.....
 encountered them and said to the Saviour: 'who has
 bidden thee to enter this sanctuary and look at
 these sacred objects, without having bathed first
 and without thy disciples having at least washed
 their feet? Thou hast entered this place which is
 unsullied, as an impure one, whilst ordinarily no
 one enters there without having washed and changed
 his clothes, nor dares to look at holy objects'.
 And immediately the Saviour stopped and looked at
 him and replied to him: 'Thou then who art in this
 sanctuary, art thou pure?'.....".

Its authenticity has been rightly enough questioned; but
 there is so much of the spirit and atmosphere of the saying
 of our Lord: "I will destroy this Temple", that one
 hesitates in disclaiming it having any basis in historic
 fact. But, apart from the question of its authenticity,
 there is the question of accounting for its existence at
 all. Presumably it was written for the purpose of explain-
 :ing some other tradition, such as the Gospels imply;
 that Jesus had condemned the Temple priesthood and treated
 with disrespect the Temple and had declared the law of
 sacrifice abolished. It has the appearance of justifying
 such an act as the entrance of Jesus into the Holy of
 Holies. And it is not improbable that some such act may
 lie/

1. Grenfell and Hunt: "Oxyrhynchus Papyri" No.840.vol.V.pp.5 f.
2. Deissmann: "Light from the Ancient East", German
 edition p.37, thinks the reference is to the Holy
 of Holies, quoted by Eisler. The point is apparently
 omitted in the English translation, see p.43. Grenfell
 and Hunt take it to refer to "The Court of the Men of
 Israel", p.8.

lie at the root of Sadducaic hostility to Him.

A Fragment of the Halosis.

Very significant, too, is the matter Eisler relates, as occurring in the Slavonic Version of Josephus. He writes:

"In this way, finally a fragment of the Halosis preserved by Suidas, and which before the discovery of the Slavonic work could not be placed, meets with a satisfactory explanation: 'we find that Josephus the....says in his memoirs...that Jesus officiated in the sanctuary with the priests'..... There was thus an express statement in Josephus to the effect that Jesus did service in the Temple with the priests".

Commenting upon the passage Eisler thinks the incident is highly probable in view of the Jewish expectation of a Messiah like the Asmonaeon Kings. And that Jesus in presuming to offer incense in the Temple as a pure sacrifice did so, conscious of His divine vocation, and without paying any heed to whether His genealogy entitled Him to take up this office. He writes:

"It is more than probable that the isolated statement in Lk.111:24, that there was a Levite in Jesus' genealogy^{was inserted} and the relationship of Mary to the Mother of John Baptist, a descendant of Aaron, was emphasized for the purpose of justifying Jesus' priestly acts while in the Temple". 2

It is certain that no such intention can be attributed to Luke, whether its occurrence in Luke's special source may be explained as Eisler thinks, ~~is another matter~~ ^{the Tradition of Jesus' Priesthood} ~~L~~ ^{may well have contained} Like his, and other scholars' conclusions/

1. Ibid. supra p.482. The passage in question has not received discussion in any literature so far as I can ascertain.
2. Ibid. p.482.

conclusions concerning the Mandaeen documents, his conclusions from and about the Russian version of Josephus have been called in question. But whereas there are valid reasons for taking exception to certain of the exaggerated claims made for the former, in view of the decisions of competent scholarship to ~~estimate~~¹ their value, there is a real dearth of those who are competent to make a pronouncement upon the claims Eisler makes on behalf of what he calls the Halosis.¹ Easton, in his discussion of Eisler's work,² thinks that Eisler's results are altogether lacking in plausibility. However, from the literature which is available on the subject, even though Eisler's reconstructions of the text may be at fault,³ and his theory of Jesus as a leader of rebellion without foundation, still he has done a real service in opening up the subject afresh.

The above statement of Suidas, Eisler, later in his book, regards as having been invented to refute two things: (1) the Jewish assertion that Jesus was a bastard, and (2) that/

1. The Russian version of Josephus' "Wars of the Jews", a non-Greek version unknown until 1893. Berendts translated it from the Slavonic in 1903 and a complete German translation appeared in 1927. Some of the most important passages are contained in H.ST. John Thackeray's edition of Josephus, in the Loeb Classical Library. The above passage is not included. The reader is also referred to "Josephus the Man and the Historian" by Thackeray (N.Y. 1929), in which certain of Eisler's results are accepted; and Marmonstein "Quest" 1926, pp. 145 ff.
2. See "Christ in the Gospels", ch. 111.
3. Vacher Burch "Jesus Christ and His Revelation" ch. V, regards Eisler's reconstructions of the text as untenable and favours those of Berendts.

that He illegally assumed to Himself priestly rights and privileges. The story was made up, he thinks, at a time when the Byzantine orthodox Church had to combat the Josephinists¹ who used Josephus' historical works to find arguments² against their Christology. If this is its origin then its relation to such a fragment as the Papyri No.840 is a very indirect one.

Though only a minimum of importance can be attached to the above sources, it is hard to account for any of them unless they represent, in some way, echoes of a controversy in which Jesus advanced priestly claims and discredited those of His opponents the Sadducees. They at least must be borne in mind when computing the evidence for Jesus having taught the doctrine of His priesthood, or for the early Church having so taught.

Some other Factors in the Trial.

To return to our examination of the accounts of the Trial of Jesus, there is the fact of the disaffection of the crowd, which has caused commentators no little perplexity. How account for the falling away of the crowd, whose presence and friendliness the evangelists have represented as the cause of the Sanhedrin's fear of arresting Jesus? According to the Gospels, His popularity made it necessary for them to carry out their fell plans during the cover of darkness. The customary explanation, that it was due to their disappointment that He had not championed the popular insurrectionist/

1. The "Josephini", an heretical sect of the Middle Ages.
2. Ibid.supra. Appendix xxiii, p.620.

that He illegally assumed to Himself priestly rights and privileges. The story was made up, he thinks, at a time when the Byzantine orthodox Church had to combat the Josephinists¹ who used Josephus' historical works to find arguments² against their Christology. If this is its origin then its relation to such a fragment as the Papyri No.840 is a very indirect one.

Though only a minimum of importance can be attached to the above sources, it is hard to account for any of them unless they represent, in some way, echoes of a controversy in which Jesus advanced priestly claims and discredited those of His opponents the Sadducees. They at least must be borne in mind when computing the evidence for Jesus having taught the doctrine of His priesthood, or for the early Church having so taught.

Some other Factors in the Trial.

To return to our examination of the accounts of the Trial of Jesus, there is the fact of the disaffection of the crowd, which has caused commentators no little perplexity. How account for the falling away of the crowd, whose presence and friendliness the evangelists have represented as the cause of the Sanhedrin's fear of arresting Jesus? According to the Gospels, His popularity made it necessary for them to carry out their fell plans during the cover of darkness. The customary explanation, that it was due to their disappointment that He had not championed the popular insurrectionist/

1. The "Josephini", an heretical sect of the Middle Ages.
2. Ibid.supra. Appendix xxiii, p.620.

insurrectionist cause as the militant Messiah, fails to explain. For, from the time of the Messianic entry, they had been given to understand, both by word and gesture, that they need expect nothing of the kind from Him. He had given them absolutely no occasion, at any time in the Jerusalem ministry, to look "for the kingdom of our Father David" in the popular sense.

Again there was nothing in the nature of the accusation which would have turned them in favour of the release of Bar-abbas; they were both regarded pretty much in the light of insurrectionists. The main difference, in the charge made against the two, is the alleged saying regarding^{ing} the Temple destruction. Schweitzer is certain that the mere telling of the people that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah would hardly rouse the fury of a mob who were clamouring for the release of an insurrectionary leader; it would rather recommend him to them. Nor would the people have been greatly concerned had Jesus claimed to be the Son of God or the Son of Man. It was not disappointment, as Cadman thinks, the mob showed; it was fury, and that of a crowd many of whom must have been Pilgrims to the Passover.¹

McNeile /

1. Manson (Mof.N.T.Com.St.Luke pp.257,258) says that the Pilgrim camp would not yet be aroused, but Easterners must have then, as now, taken advantage of the cool of the morning to be abroad; besides the fact that it was daybreak (Lk.23:66) when the Trial before the Sanhedrin began; some time elapsed before He was taken before Pilate, and the Gospels emphasize that it was the whole multitude that arose, not merely the partizans of Bar-abbas, or surely this point of injustice would not have been omitted by the evangelists.

McNeille asserts that the repetition of this charge was one of the real causes of their rage.¹ It is unlikely that a charge which had no foundation in fact, and of which the crowd had no proof other than the testimony of false witnesses, would carry even the most fickle of mobs, much less people, who, a short time hitherto, had enabled Jesus to Maintain His custom of teaching in the Temple.

Can anything be imagined which would have inflamed a Jewish crowd more at a Passover season, than to realize that Jesus really cast aspersion upon priesthood, sacrifices and Temple alike? Even the majority of the disciples and early Church could not believe it, being Jews. They continued to venerate the Temple. But a Gentile Stephen could be honest with the historic facts. And we can well believe that the authority by which Jesus had done so, and which on an occasion He had hinted at by quoting the 110th Psalm (Mk.12:35), had been fully revealed to the Temple hierarchy by Judas who came from the Lord's table at which Jesus had, like the ancient Melchizedek, brought forth bread and wine and blessed them, thereby instituting a new sacrificial observance which replaced the old and unworthy by the offering of His own body and blood for the sin of the people.

The Last Supper.

We may now turn our attention to this rite of the institution of the Supper. It is in regard to it that the above conclusions, as to the character and purpose of the Jerusalem/

1. Ibid. supra. p.412.

Jerusalem ministry, have a real and vital significance. The relationship of the Last Supper to the other events of this ministry is an enigma in the face of any apocalyptic interpretation of the events. Cadman considers, that from a strictly historical point of view, the Supper cannot be said to have had any relationship and cannot be used for an elucidation of Jesus' conception of His mission.¹ But it has been felt that there is a relationship, and the evangelists have insisted upon its relation by having Jesus go up to Jerusalem with definite fore-knowledge of the necessity of His death. They are utilizing ideas, throughout, which are poles apart from pure apocalypticism. The time of tribulation which apocalypticism taught, preceded the end, must appear as an artificial and inadequate means of relating the suffering and death of our Lord with Apocalypticism.

Most English scholars have been of the opinion, that the image of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah, is in the mind of Jesus. And though the word *lutron* does not occur in Is.53, the other parallels in thought and language, point quite definitely to this passage. Granted that our Lord's mind was moving along the lines of Is.53, on the occasion of the Supper, and, that previously His actions were dominated by an Apocalyptic outlook, then the dictum of Cadman appears justified. Nevertheless, we hold that there is a real relationship, and that the Suffering Servant conception/

1. Ibid.supra. p.155.

Chapter LX

conception is neither a post-resurrection interpretation of the Cross and the Supper nor an element which is unrelated to the events of the Jerusalem ministry.

Together with the fact that the Suffering Servant represents the ideal form which the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal of a priest-king gave rise to, and apart from whether Jesus was aware that it expressed the ancient ideal - knowledge of which we have no reason to doubt He was in possession of - it is the natural form which His thoughts would take, had He been enacting the role of Priest-king, and attempting a reform of Judaism. Failing in that attempt and despairing of the essential value and merit of the whole system, to what other passage in the whole of the prophecy could His thought have turned to, more naturally, than the figure of the Suffering Servant. By His death He would turn defeat into glorious victory. If influenced at all, as He must have been by the Maccabaeen heroes' deeds, then, too, His mind was filled with the efficacy of their martyrdoms. The parallelism, between the conception of Is.53 and the martyr deaths of the Maccabaeen age, is seen in the following passages:

"Phineas our father in that he was exceedingly zealous, obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood". (1 Mac.2:54 cf. Sirach 45:23,24). Again in the prayer of Eleazar the thought is particularly close to that expressed by our Lord:

"Thou O God knowest that I might save myself. I am dying by fiery torments for They Law. Be merciful unto thy people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction on their behalf. Make my blood their purification and take my soul to ransom their souls", (4 Mac.6:27-29).

Thus/

Thus also: "and our country was purified, they having as it were become a ransom for our nation's sin; and through the blood of these righteous men and the propitiation of their death, the Divine providence delivered Israel that was before evilly treated", (4 Mac.17:22). 1

As a matter of fact, the Last Supper, far from throwing no light upon the mission of Jesus in Jerusalem, provides a real key to the purpose and character of it.

We venture to suggest, though it is not completely demonstrable, that the difficult problem of the origin and nature of the Last Supper, may find solution exactly along these lines of thought. Behind the account of this meal, as set forth in Mark and independent of Paul, lies neither the Kiddush nor the Passover meal, in both of which, there is not an exact parallel with the institution in Mark. Scholars have been of the opinion that the Eucharist has some connection with those common meals which are seen to have existed early in the Apostolic Church, and also to have connections with other meals which our Lord took with His disciples. But the relationship between them all, has been far from clear. The suggestion which ~~Marborough~~ makes, that our Lord may have been following the example of Melchizedek who likewise brought forth bread and wine and blessed them, certainly merits serious consideration.

If/

1. Quotations from Charles' "Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphy". In the Introduction, section (9), redemption through sacrifice, in this literature, is discussed.
2. See Brilioth: "Eucharistic Faith and Practice", ch.1 'The New Testament Basis'.
3. See Hastings' D.B. vol.11, p.637.
4. See Oesterley: "The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy", p.183.
5. "Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation", pp.38,39.

If our view of the character of the Jerusalem ministry be that which we have indicated, then there can be little question of the real basis of the meal which He took with His disciples on that last night. He was repeating a rite which on previous occasions had taken place between Himself and His disciples. On the road to Emmaus they recognized Him by His manner of breaking bread (Lk.24:35). At the Last Supper, the rite became the medium whereby He made known to them, the meaning and efficacy of His death. This simple ancient rite, through which they had customarily had fellowship and received the blessing of Jesus as Abraham did of Melchizedek, now became, not only the assurance of their continued fellowship with Him, but it was the means whereby He expressed the sacrificial character of His death.

Our Lord stresses the newness of the institution (Heb.8:13 cf.Mk.14:24). The Levitical system, which He had repudiated, was now replaced by the sacrifice made once for all (Heb.7:27, 9:28). Hoskyns writes: "In the words 'This is my body' it is exceedingly difficult not to find a conscious superseding and fulfilment of the Old Testament sacrificial system".¹ In the same act He also fulfilled the function of the great high-priest. Prof. Manson says: "If He fulfilled the apocalyptic idea in Israel, He no less fulfilled the sacrificial and the priestly".² In doing so, we believe, He was not unconscious of/

1. "Mysterium Christi", chapter 'Jesus The Messiah.', p.87
 2. "Christ's View of the Kingdom", p.143.

If our view of the character of the Jerusalem ministry be that which we have indicated, then there can be little question of the real basis of the meal which He took with His disciples on that last night. He was repeating a rite which on previous occasions had taken place between Himself and His disciples. On the road to Emmaus they recognized Him by His manner of breaking bread (Lk.24:35). At the Last Supper, the rite became the medium whereby He made known to them, the meaning and efficacy of His death. This simple ancient rite, through which they had customarily had fellowship and received the blessing of Jesus as Abraham did of Melchizedek, now became, not only the assurance of their continued fellowship with Him, but it was the means whereby He expressed the sacrificial character of His death.

Our Lord stresses the newness of the institution (Heb.8:13 cf.Mk.14:24). The Levitical system, which He had repudiated, was now replaced by the sacrifice made once for all (Heb.7:27, 9:28). Hoskyns writes: "In the words 'This is my body' it is exceedingly difficult not to find a conscious superseding and fulfilment of the Old Testament sacrificial system"¹. In the same act He also fulfilled the function of the great high-priest. Prof. Manson says: "If He fulfilled the apocalyptic idea in Israel, He no less fulfilled the sacrificial and the priestly"². In doing so, we believe, He was not unconscious of/

1. "Mysterium Christi", chapter 'Jesus The Messiah.', p.87
 2. "Christ's View of the Kingdom", p.143.

of His fulfilment of the ancient Messianic prophetic ideal, of the Priest-king, represented in the figure of the Suffering Servant of God. His ministry thus becomes a unity from beginning to end. The priest-king, who is consecrated by Baptism, unfolds the latent ideas of that role, through a progressive crescendo of achievement which reaches its climax in the priestly offering of Himself upon Calvary.

The failure, of New Testament writers, to make explicit mention of the association of Jesus with the person of Melchizedek, has already been commented upon. Further reasons offer themselves in view of the obvious intention of the evangelists, or their sources, to resist the idea that there was anything of the revolutionary, about Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem, and to deny the charge that He had condemned the whole Judaistic system. To have continued to ascribe to Him the role of a priest-king after the order of Melchizedek, was too dangerous a claim for the followers who had seen His kingly claims mocked and placarded upon the Cross. With more hope of being unmolested, they could speak of Him, as kurios, and Son of Man - this last title under which He had cloaked His Messianic role. They were content to speak of Him as a Heavenly King and a Heavenly Priest, who made intercession for them.

But, besides the evidence of the events of the Jerusalem ministry and the speech of Stephen which only imply the designation, there is that significant saying in the/

the Fourth Gospel, (Jn.8:56 cf.Gen.14:18): "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day and he saw it and was glad. Then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old and hast Thou seen Abraham?". Wuttke's comment, upon the passage has been already alluded to: "When Jesus speaks of Abraham having seen his day, only the Melchizedek scene can be meant"¹. It is a single isolated reference to the tradition of Jesus' association of Himself with the ancient Melchizedek, but it gives striking corroboration of all which has been said regarding the Messianic consciousness of Jesus revealed in His Jerusalem ministry.

Summary.

We shall now try to gather together what may be legitimately inferred from the study of Jesus' final ministry, as to the nature of His Messianic consciousness. It may be taken for granted that the popular Messianic title of Son of David is out of the question, because of Jesus' own explicit rejection of the same. Can it be said that He substituted the title Son of Man? The evangelists' accounts certainly point to that conclusion. However, in their accounts of His use of that title, they express so much that transcends the normal eschatological connotation, that one hesitates to think that Jesus seriously laid claim to a title which obviously was inadequate to His purposes. This difficulty is partly met by saying that, "Jesus accepted the role of the Servant of God in the present age and the role/

1. "Melchizedek der Priester-Konig von Salem" 1927, p.39.

role of the Son of Man in the age to come".¹ But surely the title of "Servant" cannot be said to find its complement, in the age to come, in^{an} even a less idealistic title such as the "Son of Man". It is not much more satisfactory to think that Jesus welded the two conceptions into one, as the expression of His conception of His Person. Of course both of these latter explanations accord well with the Synoptic portrayal of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. But is it, therefore, Jesus' thought of Himself?

For the following reasons we question the Synoptists' adherence to the historical Messianic consciousness of Jesus: (1) The variety of titles ascribed to Him by the early Church, indicates that one title has apparently almost an equal authority with another. (2) The fact that Paul never applies the title Son of Man to Jesus. (3) The title King is not involved whatever in that of Son of Man, and that He claimed kingship, in some sense, is indisputable. (4) The total inadequacy of the title Son of Man in accounting for the events of the Jerusalem ministry as a whole. (5) The strong evidence which exists for believing that the Gospels are written from a dogmatic interest, which reads post-resurrection experiences into the life of our Lord, inclines one to think that the title Son of Man, is largely the result of later reflection, based probably upon Jesus' pseudonymous use of it. (6) The tendency to minimize the national character of Jesus' mission.

In/

1. See Rawlinson: "Essays on^{the} Trinity and Incarnation", p.31.

role of the Son of Man in the age to come¹". But surely the title of "Servant" cannot be said to find its complement, in the age to come, in^{an} even less idealistic title such as the "Son of Man". It is not much more satisfactory to think that Jesus welded the two conceptions into one, as the expression of His conception of His Person. Of course both of these latter explanations accord well with the Synoptic portrayal of Jesus' Messianic consciousness. But is it, therefore, Jesus' thought of Himself?

For the following reasons we question the Synoptists' adherence to the historical Messianic consciousness of Jesus: (1) The variety of titles ascribed to Him by the early Church, indicates that one title has apparently almost an equal authority with another. (2) The fact that Paul never applies the title Son of Man to Jesus. (3) The title King is not involved whatever in that of Son of Man, and that He claimed kingship, in some sense, is indisputable. (4) The total inadequacy of the title Son of Man in accounting for the events of the Jerusalem ministry as a whole. (5) The strong evidence which exists for believing that the Gospels are written from a dogmatic interest, which reads post-resurrection experiences into the life of our Lord, inclines one to think that the title Son of Man, is largely the result of later reflection, based probably upon Jesus' pseudonymous use of it. (6) The tendency to minimize the national character of Jesus' mission.

In/

1. See Rawlinson: "Essays on^{the} Trinity and Incarnation", p.31.

In view of the following considerations the title priest-king is held to be a more plausible characterization of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus: (1) It expresses not only the qualities of the Suffering Servant, but is the actual figure about which the singer^{in Is. 53,} has written. (2) The priest-king after the order of Melchizedek is the ancient Jewish Messianic ideal which finds its finest expression in Is. 53, which undoubtedly influenced our Lord. (3) It is a role which will account, as none other will, for the events of the Jerusalem ministry, the Messianic Entry, the Cleansing of the Temple, the saying with regard to its destruction, the reply to the question of His authority, the Messianic secret, the Betrayal, the Sadducaic hostility to Him and the early Church, the institution of the Supper, His Trial, condemnation, and the title on the Cross. (4) It relates His mission to that of the Baptist's. (5) It accounts for the Church's later adoption of less antagonizing titles by which to designate Him. (6) It expresses both the temporal and eternal aspect of His life and teaching, identifying Him with the hopes and aspirations and ideals of the Judaism of the past and His own time, and justifying the later picture of Ecclesiasticism, of a Heavenly King and Priest. (7) It gives a unity to the events of that whole ministry in which One called of God sought to be both true leader and true servant. (8) It is not likely that Jesus would have failed to discern the highest title and noblest Messianic office contained in the literature of His race - He/

He did not fail!

We admit that the author of "Hebrews" is apparently ignorant of any such tradition. We are far from suggesting that the writer is dependent upon, or utilizing any such facts^{from the history} of the historical Jesus. His thoughts are entirely directed towards the Heavenly High-priest. He explicitly tells us that if our Lord were on earth He would not be a priest at all. However, if Jesus once had had aspirations to High-priesthood within the purified Jerusalem Temple, how naturally, in the face of approaching death, would the priestly duties of the Messianic priest-king be transferred to a Heavenly sphere. But our contention has not to do with such a conjecture, valid as it may be. What we do maintain is that it was some such tradition as was outlined in this chapter, which in the first place occasioned the formulation of the Church's doctrine of the priesthood of Christ. The author, we reiterate, was simply expounding a well known doctrine of the same. And though his emphasis is plainly upon the office of priest, the ancient Messianic conception of the priest-king is constantly appearing in the development of his theme.

1. See page 60 where we have insisted that it is not as Prof. Moffatt thinks the primitive kingly Deliverer who thus intrudes in this writing ~~but~~ is the ancient Messianic ideal of the priest-king of the 110th Psalm.

We respectfully submit the above interpretation of the character and purpose of the Epistle to the Hebrews, together with the conclusions reached as to the primary source and sources of the central doctrine, the Priesthood of Christ. Our view has, at least, those factors indicated to recommend it. We are either altogether mistaken in taking this position, or there are other facts, of which we are unaware, that further enhance the conclusions of the preceding chapters. Indeed, we believe that future discovery within that primitive and uncertain field of tradition, may do much towards confirming some of our main contentions.

For the Epistle's teaching regarding the Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ, far from being an isolated phenomenon of First Century Christian theological speculation, expresses - whether the writer was aware of it or not - the quintessence of the ideal religious values contained in Is.53. The priest-king who as the obedient Servant gave himself for the ransom of many. Though the author of "Hebrews" did not refer to Isaiah 53, any more than did St.Stephen and his group, nevertheless he has given to us in the most inspired diction of the New Testament literature, the precise significance of the Redemption wrought by One who was the obedient Servant in life and died for us outside the Camp.

In respect of these teachings of priesthood and sacrifice our author is in fundamental agreement with certain elements in the underlying traditional material of the four Gospels. In particular his teaching is to be identified with/

with that Hellenistic Group within the primitive Church who set aside the Levitical priesthood and sacrificial system for the true High-priesthood and true Sacrifice of Christ - echoes of which are contained in Pauline and other Epistolary literature. And in so doing our author and the Seven, as well as the Church Fathers, were being true to the very word and intention of their Lord.

We have a Great High Priest.

Consequently, in very truth, we with the first readers of "Hebrews" must hold fast this central teaching of the Christian "Confession" the High-priesthood of our Risen Lord. "For we have not an High-Priest who cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities, but was tempted in all points like as we....Let us therefore come boldly before the Throne of Grace that we may receive mercy and find grace to help us in time of need (4:14-15)".

We have a Sacrifice.

Again, we must hold fast this other corollary truth of our "Confession", Christ our Sacrifice. For it was not by chance that our author has given the Church Catholic, that which became the heart of the Christian Eucharistic Liturgies. The Sacrifice of Himself, which, then, rendered obsolete all past and future sacrifice, was the sublimest truth of the institution of the Eucharist by our Lord. Jesus is the authority for the ecclesiastical claim, as He was the authority for the one who wrote:

"How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?, (1X:14).

A LIST OF THE BOOKS AND ARTICLES REFERRED TO IN
THIS THESIS, TOGETHER WITH SOME OTHERS
CONSULTED IN ITS PREPARATION.

- Abrahams, I : "Studies in Phariseism and the Gospels",
2 vols. Oxford 1917 and 1924.
- Alexander, W : "Leading Ideas of the Gospels" (3rd edition)
MacMillan 1892.
- Allen, W.C. : "The Gospel according to St. Mark" (Oxford Church
Biblical Commentary) 1915.
- Bacon, B.W. : "The Beginnings of Gospel Story", London 1909;
an article: "Jesus as Son of Man" Harvard Theol.
Review vol.iii, July 1910;
"The Apostolic Message", New York 1925.
"Jesus and Paul", London 1920.
"Jesus the Son of God" (Kent Schaffer Memorial
Lecture) Yale 1930.
"Studies in Matthew", London 1930.
Article "The Priesthood without Pedigree" Expos.
Times xiii May 1902.
Article "The Doctrine of Faith in Hebrew James"
etc. J.B.L. xix 1900.
"The Gospel of Mark" Yale University Press 1925.
Article "The Sinless High Priest" Expos. Times
xxxiii.
Article "Wisdom" in Hastings' D.C.G. vol.ii.
- Barnes, W.E. : "Haggai and Zechariah" (Cambridge Bible) 1917.
- Barnes, M. : Article "Hibbert Journal" xxx, 1931.
- Blakiston, A. : "John the Baptist and his Relation to Jesus",
London 1912.
- Boutflower : Psalm CX (its authorship) Gen. XLV (its Histor-
ical character) 1926.
- Bruce, A.B. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews", Edinburgh 1899.
- Burch, Vacher : "Jesus Christ and His Revelation", London 1927.
- Brehier, E. : "Des Idees Philosophique et Religieuses de Philo"
Paris 1908.
- Bousset, W. : "Jesus" London 1906.
- Bowen, C.R. : Article "A New Study of John the Baptist" in
"Studies in Early Christianity" (Edited by S.J.
Case) Century Co. 1928.
- Box, G.H. : Article, "The Value and Significance of the O.T.
in Relation to the New Testament" in "The People
and the Book" (edited by Peake).
Article, "The Sadducees" in E.R.E. vol. XI.

- Brandt, E. : Article "Mandaeans" E.R.E. viii.
- Brilioth, Y. : "Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Catholic and Evangelical" London 1930.
- Burkitt, F.C. : "The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus" London 1910.
 "Christian Beginnings" London 1924.
 "The Church and Gnosis" Cambridge 1932.
 Article "Life of Jesus" in "History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge" (edited by
- Burton, E. DeWitt: "The Teaching of Jesus" Chicago 1924.
- Cadman, W.H. : "The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem" Oxford 1923.
- Case, J.I. : "The Rise of Christian Messianism" in "Studies in Early Christianity" Century Co. 1928.
- Charles, R.H. : "The Book of the Secrets of Enoch" Oxford 1896.
 "The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs" London 1908.
 "Fragments of a Zadokite Work" Oxford 1912.
 "The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament", Oxford 1913.
 "The Book of Jubilees", London 1902.
- Cheyne, T.K. : "The Christian Use of the Psalms" London 1899.
- Crumm, J.M.C. : "The Original Jerusalem Gospel" Constable 1927.
- Dalman, G.H. : "Jesus-Jeshua" London 1929.
 "The Words of Jesus", Edinburgh 1902.
- Davidson, A.B.: "Biblical and Critical Essays" London 1902.
 "Hebrews" (Handbook for Bible classes) Edinburgh 1882.
- Debelius, M. : Article "The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels" in Harvard Theol. Review XX, 1927 July.
- Deissmann, G.A: "Light from the Ancient East" London 1927.
- Deissmann and Bell : "Mysterium Christi" (Composite) Longmans Green 1930.
- Delitzsch, F.: "Messianic Prophecies" Edinburgh 1892 (English Trans.).
- Denney, J. : "The Death of Christ" London 1902.
- Dobschutz, E. : "Christian Life in the Primitive Church" London 1904.
- Dods, M. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Expos. Greek Text Commentary).

- Driver, S.R. : "The Book of Genesis" (Westminster Commentary)
London 1904.
- Drummond, F. : "Philo Judaeus" vols. 1 and 2 Harvard
University Press 1927.
- Dubose, W.P. : "Highpriesthood and Sacrifice" Longmans Green
1908.
- Easton, B.S. : "Christ in the Gospels" London 1930.
- Edwards, T.C. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Expos. Bible)
London 1887.
- Eisler, Robt. : "The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist",
Methuen 1931.
- Emmet, G.W. : "The Eschatological Question in the Gospels"
Edinburgh 1911.
Article "Messiah" in E.R.E.
- Epiphanius : "Haerex" (Patrologiae edited by J.P. Migne
Tomus XL1, XL11).
- Fairbairn, P. : "The Typology of Scripture" 2 vol. Edinburgh
1867.
- Findlay, J.A. : Article "The Book of Testimonies and the
First Gospel" in The Expositor, XX.
- Gayford, S.C. : "Sacrifice and Priesthood" London 1924.
- Gifford : "The Incarnation" Longmans Green & Co. 1911.
- Goguel, M. : "Jesus the Nazarene Myth or History" (Eng.
Trans.) London 1926.
"La Vie de Jésus" Paris 1932.
Article, "The Problem of Jesus" Harvard Theol.
Review xxiii April 1930.
- Goodrick, A.T.S. : "The Book of Wisdom" London 1913.
- Goodspeed, E.J. : "New Solutions of New Testament Problems"
Chicago 1927.
- Gray, Buchanan. : "Sacrifice in the Old Testament" Oxford 1925.
- Grenfell, B.P. and
Hunt, A.S. : "Oxyrhynchus Papyri" vol. V.
- Gressmann, H. : "Der Messias" Gottingen 1929.
- Guthrie, K.S. : "The Message of Philo Judaeus" London 1909
- Harris, Rendel. : "Testimonies" (assisted by V. Burch) 2 vol.
Cambridge 1920.
Article "Jesus and the Exodus" Expositor
July 1919.
Article "The Sinless Highpriest" Expos. Times
xxxiii.

- Harnack : "History of Dogma" London 1899.
- Hausrath, A. : "A History of New Testament Times" 2 vols. London 1880.
- Hengstenberg, E.W. : "The Christology of the Old Testament" (Eng. Trans. Edinburgh 1836).
- Herford, R.T. : "Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash" London 1903.
- Hommel, F. : "Ancient Hebrew Tradition", London 1897 (Eng. Trans.).
- Horner, G. : "Pistis Sophia" (translated from the Coptic) London 1924.
- Hoskyns, E. and N. Davey : "The Riddle of the New Testament" London 1931
- Hoskyns, E. : "Jesus the Messiah" in "Mysterium Christi" (Composite) 1930.
- Jackson, Foakes and Kirsopp Lake : "The Beginnings of Christianity" vol.1, London 1920.
- Kennedy, H.A.A. : "Philo's Contribution to Religion" London 1919.
"The Theology of the Epistles" London 1919.
- Kennett, R.H. : "Old Testament Essays" Cambridge 1928.
- Kidd, B.J. : "A History of the Church", Vol.1, Oxford 1922.
- Klausner, J. : "Jesus of Nazareth" London 1925.
- Knox, W.L. : "St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem" Cambridge 1931.
- König, Eduard : "Die Messianischen Weissagungen des Alten Testaments" Stuttgart, 1923.
- Lake, Kirsopp : "The Stewardship of Faith", London 1915.
"The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul" London 1911.
"The date of the Slavonic Enoch" Harvard Theol. Review, XVI October 1923.
- Lambert, J.C. : Article "Confession" in Hastings' D.C.G. vol.1.
- Lawlor, H.J. : "Eusebiana" Oxford 1912.
- Leszynski : "Die Sadducaer" Berlin 1912.
- Lightly, J. : "Jewish Sects and Parties during the Time of Christ", London 1925.
- Lunnemann, G. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Meyer Commentary Eng. Trans.) Edinburgh 1882.

- Manson, Wm. : "Christ's View of the Kingdom of God", London 1918.
 "The Gospel of St. Luke" (Moffatt New Testament Commentary) London 1930.
- McFadyen, J.F.: "Through Eternal Spirit" T.T.Clark 1924.
- McGiffert, A.C: "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age" Edinburgh 1928.
- MacKinnon, J.: "The Historic Jesus" London 1931.
- McLaren, Canon: Article, "The New Covenant" C.Q.R.cxv.Oct.1932.
- MacNeill, H.L: "The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews".
- McNeile, A.H. : "The Gospel according to St. Matthew" (Greek Text) London, 1915.
 "New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's", Cambridge 1923.
 Article:-
- Mead, J.R.S. : "The Mandeans - a peculiar People", The Quest XLIII, 1926.
- Milligan, G. : "The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews" Edinburgh 1899.
- Moffatt, Jas.: "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (I.C.C.) Edinburgh 1924.
 "Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament", Edinburgh 1928.
 Article, "John Baptist" in "History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge" (Composite) London 1929.
- Montefiore, C.G.: "The Religious Teachings of Jesus" MacMillan 1910.
- Moody, Campbell: "The Purpose of Jesus" (Bruce Lectures) London 1928.
 "The Faith of The Early Christian Converts" London 1925
- Moore, G.F. : "Judaism" vols.1 and 2, Cambridge (Mass.) 1927-30.
- Moulton, R.G. : "Ecclesiasticus" London 1896.
- Mozeley, J.K. : "The Doctrine of the Atonement" London 1916.
- Nairne, A. : "The Epistle of Priesthood" Edinburgh 1913.
- Neubauer and Driver : "Jewish Interpreters of Isaiah 53" Edinburgh 1877.

- Oesterley, W.O.E. and
G.H.Box : "The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue"
London 1911.
- Oesterley, W.O.E.: "The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation in
Hebrew Literature" London, 1910.
"The Books of the Apocrypha" London 1914.
"The Evolution of the Messianic Idea"
London 1908.
"The Jewish Background of the Christian
Liturgy", Oxford 1925.
"A History of Israel" vol.ii, London 1930.
- Ottley, R.L. : "Some Aspects of the Old Testament"
London 1897.
- Pallis, S.V. : "Mandaean Studies" Oxford 1929.
- Peake, A.S. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Century Bible)
Edinburgh 1902.
- Pfliederer, O. : "Primitive Christianity" vols.1 and 11,
London 1906.
"Philo Judaeus", C.D.Young's Translation
4 vols. Bohn's Library (1855).
- Plooif, D. : Article "Jesus and the Temple" Expository
Times xlvii.
- Plummer, A. : "The Gospel according to St.Luke" (I.C.C.)
Edinburgh 1896.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J.: "The New Testament Doctrine of Christ"
Longmans Green 1926.
Chapter, "The Interpretation of the Christ
in the New Testament" in "Foundations"
(Composite) 1912.
"Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation"
London 1928.
- Rendall, G.H. : "The Epistle of James and Judaic Christian-
ity" Cambridge 1927.
- Rendall, F. : "Hebrews" (Greek and English with Notes)
London 1883.
- Riehm, E. : "Messianic Prophecy " (2nd edition) Edinburgh
1891.
- Robinson, J.A. : "The Historical Character of St.John's
Gospel" London 1907.
- Robinson, T.H. : "The Gospel of St.Matthew" (Moffatt New
Testament Commentary) London, 1928.
- Selwyn, E.C. : "The Oracles in the New Testament" London
1914.

- Sanday, W. : "Priesthood and Sacrifice" (Report of a Conference 1900).
- Schonfield, H. : "The Lost Book of the Nativity of John", London 1929.
- Schweitzer, A. : "The Quest of the Historical Jesus" London 1910.
- Schultz, H. : "Old Testament Theology", vol.ii Edinburgh 1892.
- Sharpe, John : "Three Lectures with Notes", Deighton Bell and Co. 1892.
- Scott, E.F. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews", Edinburgh 1922.
 "The Kingdom of God in the New Testament", MacMillan 1931.
 "The Epistle to the Hebrews and Roman Christianity", xiii Harvard Theol. Review July 1920.
- Siegfried, E. : "Philoxenus of Alexandria", Yena 1875.
- Skinner, J. : "Isaiah 11" (Cambridge Bible).
- Stanton, V.H. : "The Jewish and Christian Messiah", Edinburgh 1886.
- Strachan, R.H. : "The Historic Jesus in the New Testament".
- Streeter, B.H. : "The Four Gospels" London 1924.
 "The Primitive Church" London 1929.
- Swete, H.B. : "The Ascended Christ", MacMillan 1911.
- Thackeray, H.S. : Edition of Josephus (Loeb Classical Library) Putnam's 1928.
 "Josephus the Man and the Historian", New York 1929.
- Torrey, C.C. : "The Second Isaiah", T.T. Clark 1929.
- Tucker, M.A.R. : Article, "The Gospel according to Prisca", Nineteenth Century, Jan. 1913.
- Waddell, H.C. : Article, "Hebrews", Expositor Sept. 1923.
- Walker, T. : "Jesus and Jewish Teaching", London 1923.
- Warfield, B. : "Christ our Sacrifice" Princeton Theol. Review, July 1917.
 "Christology and Criticism", New York 1929.
- Westcott : "The Epistle to the Hebrews", London 1892.
- Westcott and Hart. : "The New Testament in Greek", New York 1925.
- Wickham, E.C. : "The Epistle to the Hebrews" (Westminster Commentary) London.

- Williams, Lukyn : "Jewish Christian Messiah" London 1914.
- Windisch, Hans : "Der Hebraerbrief" (Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament 14) Tübingen 1931.
- Wuttke, Gottfried: "Melchizedech der Priesterkönig von Salem" (Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese) Berlin 1927.
- Vos, G. : "The Priesthood of Christ in Hebrews". Princeton Theol. Review 1907.
- Warschauer, J. : "The Historical Life of Christ" London 1927.
- Welch, A. : "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews", Edinburgh 1898.
- Whitehouse, O.C.: "11 Isaiah" (Century Bible) Edinburgh.

GENERAL REFERENCE LITERATURE.

- Hastings' : Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.
Dictionary of the Bible
Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics
- The Encyclopedia Biblica; The Encyclopedia Britannica.
- Journal of Theological Studies, Hibbert Journal, Expository Times.
- The Expositor; The Quest.
- The Ante-Nicene Christian Library: The Nicene and Post-Nicene Library; Patrologiae edited by J.P. Migne.
- The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint (Edited by H.B. Swete).

If our view of the character of the Jerusalem ministry be that which we have indicated, then there can be little question of the real basis of the meal which He took with His disciples on that last night. He was repeating a rite which on previous occasions had taken place between Himself and His disciples. On the road to Emmaus they recognized Him by His manner of breaking bread (Lk.24:35). At the Last Supper, the rite became the medium whereby He made known to them, the meaning and efficacy of His death. This simple ancient rite, through which they had customarily had fellowship and received the blessing of Jesus as Abraham did of Melchizedek, now became, not only the assurance of their continued fellowship with Him, but it was the means whereby He expressed the sacrificial character of His death.

Our Lord stresses the newness of the institution (Heb.8:13 cf.Mk.14:24). The Levitical system, which He had repudiated, was now replaced by the sacrifice made once for all (Heb.7:27, 9:28). Hoskyns writes: "In the words 'This is my body' it is exceedingly difficult not to find a conscious superseding and fulfilment of the Old Testament sacrificial system"¹. In the same act He also fulfilled the function of the great high-priest. Prof. Manson says: "If He fulfilled the apocalyptic idea in Israel, He no less fulfilled the sacrificial and the priestly"². In doing so, we believe, He was not unconscious of/

1. "Mysterium Christi", chapter 'Jesus The Messiah.', p.87
 2. "Christ's View of the Kingdom", p.143.